

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER  
AND  
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

JULY, 1852.

ART. I.—PALFREY'S ACADEMICAL LECTURES.\*

NOTHING could be more characteristic of Dr. Palfrey than the motto with which he closes the Preface to his last two volumes :—

“ Before thy sacred altar, heavenly Truth !  
I bow in age, as erst I bowed in youth.  
Still let me bow, till this weak frame decay,  
And my last hour be lighted by thy ray ! ”

It falls not within our scope to take cognizance of the department of life in which his name has of late been so prominently before the public. We would only suggest, that in our own times no traits are so sure to render a politician impracticable and unavailable as entire self-consistency and rigid uprightness ; and that an office-holder or a candidate for the votes of the people is never so likely to be misapprehended, or utterly non-apprehended, as when under the impulse of but a single motive force, and that force an honest, strenuous sense of duty. As a preacher, pastor, and theological professor,

\* *Academical Lectures on the Jewish Scriptures and Antiquities.* By JOHN GORHAM PALFREY. 4 Vols. Boston. Vols. I. and II., James Munroe and Company. Vols. III. and IV., Crosby, Nichols, and Company. Vol. I., 1838. Vol. II., 1840. Vols. III. and IV., 1852. 8vo. pp. xx., 511; xix., 435; xxxi., 503; xiii., 500.

no man can have won a higher place in the regard, or a more cherished home in the affections, of parishioners and pupils, than Dr. Palfrey still holds with very many, who can never forget or adequately acknowledge their obligations to him, both for his fidelity to them personally and for his example of conscientious living. Less than this we cannot say, much more than this we would gladly say, as we apply ourselves to the respectful and kindly, though not wholly approving, criticism of the volumes before us.

We would remark, in the first place, that it is hardly possible that within equal space there should be collected more manifest marks and more copious fruits of careful research, thorough scholarship, and ingenious criticism. Original authorities, when accessible, have always been consulted; and when they were beyond reach, recourse has been had to the fountains of information nearest the source. The materials for the history of the Hebrew canon and for the external history of the several canonical and apocryphal books are presented, in a closely condensed form indeed, but with an accuracy and completeness seldom approached, and never surpassed. The estimation in which the Lectures themselves are held must of course depend in a great measure on the reader's reception or rejection of the author's theory. But, independently of these, the finely printed foot-notes comprise a large and valuable amount of textual criticism, covering for the more important books all the difficult or disputed passages, and often opening a new and self-approving significance, where no light is cast by any English or American commentator. Indeed, there is in the English language no commentary on the Old Testament which we regard as proffering to the common reader so much exegetical aid as is afforded by these volumes for the interpretation of the Pentateuch, most of the historical, and some of the prophetic books.

We regard it as a crowning merit of these Lectures, that they never suppress facts, or garble authorities, in order to sustain a preconceived theory. In this regard they stand in advantageous contrast to most German works of the rationalistic school, the authors of which cull their facts and pack their witnesses with careful reference to their theories, and therefore fall far short of

furnishing the requisite materials for the candid judgment of their several hypotheses. Dr. Palfrey meets with honest front, though not always, as we think, with successful antagonism, all the objections to his views of the Old Testament, and thus, if he is wrong, furnishes with the most liberal hand the materials for his own refutation. Truth is evidently the last thing that he fears. Yet we think that we can trace in his mind one characteristic which is adapted to render his labors more valuable in detail than in their results. Some minds (and especially those which are purely aesthetic, and which have little regard for truth for its own sake) are endowed with an exemplary patience and forbearance, and reach their conclusions only after elaborate investigation and reflection. Others (often from their intense longing for the truth) cry *Eῦρηκα* too soon, leap at their conclusions before they have made a thorough survey of the field of research, and adopt them too heartily to discern adequate reasons for reversing or modifying them. This we think somewhat the case with our author. Fervently devout, deeply solicitous to feel, as well as to believe, all divine verities, he incorporates into his spiritual nature his theoretical conclusions, and subsequently finds himself unable so to detach them, and to regard them objectively, as to submit them to a just reconsideration.

As regards the canon of the Hebrew Scriptures, we cannot coincide with Dr. Palfrey's view. He represents the canon as unsettled and fluctuating, and rightly if we consider all contemporary authorities as of equal weight. Certain it is, that, if the Alexandrine and Christian lists and statements be deemed of no less validity than the Hebrew, we must doubt the genuineness and the anciently reputed sacredness of a large portion of the Jewish Scriptures. But there is abundant reason to set aside Alexandrine and Christian authorities on this point. The Septuagint was probably compiled less as a collection of standard religious books, than as an anthology of Hebrew literature. In this latter aspect it was currently regarded by all except Jews; and we have no proof that even the Hellenistic Jews ever looked upon this version with special interest or reverence. Its contents were therefore liable to vary with the convenience and taste of copyists and their employers. It was in

this form chiefly that the Old Testament was known to the early Christians, who were for the most part ignorant of the language, and sceptical of the authority, of the nation which had given birth to the Founder of their religion, only to harass, reject, and crucify him. On the other hand, if we trace back the canon through strictly Hebrew sources, we find no essential discrepancy as to its contents; but have ample reason to believe that the Old Testament substantially as we have it has occupied the same place in the faith and reverence of the whole Hebrew nation which it does now. To be sure, the Jews themselves divided these books into the Law, the Prophets, and the Hagiographa; but this division had reference to the kind of books rather than to their relative degrees of sacredness. The Prophets were at our Saviour's time read concurrently with the Law in the synagogue service, and the very name attached to this division sufficiently indicates that it was regarded as an essential part of the records of Divine revelation. The language of Josephus is very explicit as to the distinction between these thirty-nine books (or twenty-two, as they are according to the Hebrew arrangement) and other Jewish writings:—“From Artaxerxes down to our time every thing has been recorded. But these records are not accounted worthy of equal credit with those before them, because the succession of the prophets has not been exact. And it is plain in our conduct what credit we have given to our Scriptures. For, though so long a time has passed, *no one has ventured to add any thing to them, nor take away from them, nor alter them.* But it is innate with the Jews from their very birth, to esteem them directions of God, and adhere to them, and even cheerfully to die for them, if need should be.”

Now, with regard to writings of such remote antiquity, it is impossible that we should have the same kind of testimony to the circumstances of their authorship which we can adduce for books of more recent origin. But we can conceive of no higher attestation than that of the unanimous reception, faith, and reverence of an entire nation. There must have been a time when each of these books assumed its sacred character. If any one of them was ever regarded in a different light, we cannot imagine the conjuncture of circumstances under which

its fixed character should have been changed, and a book which was deemed to possess neither sacredness nor authority should have been exalted to a place by the side of the Pentateuch. Such a transfer could not have been made without opposition or remonstrance, and this opposition or remonstrance must needs have been so prolonged and perpetuated as to have left some traces of itself in the record of Jewish opinions. In urging this argument, we by no means contend that each of these books must have been regarded as flowing from the direct inspiration of God, in order to have taken its place in the canon. But they must all have been regarded as religious books, written with a religious purpose, by men who had claims upon the confidence of the nation as authentic historians of the theocracy, or as expositors of the Divine will and law. We are aware that the Canticles present a strong *prima facie* objection to this reasoning, and, we contend, the only one. Of this strange book we hardly know what to say. We regard it as worse than worthless, nor are we fully satisfied with any mode of accounting for its place in the canon. But the fact of its being there disposes us strongly to believe that it may have been written with a religious purpose; that it may have been an allegory composed by Solomon, or by some one who, like him, had a far better appreciation of the coarse and voluptuous imagery which he employed, than of the sacred truths obscured and disfigured by the thick drapery of sensuality; and that the offensive spiritual interpretations of orthodox commentators may therefore have more of truth in them, than the views of those who interpret it as a mere love-song. Yet, if this supposition be entitled to no credit, still the surprising fact that one such fragmentary book should have somehow crept into the canon detracts little from the improbability that any number of these books should have ever come to be regarded in a different aspect from that in which they were received when they first gained currency.

A similar consideration applies to all the theories which represent large portions of the prophetical books as having emanated from different authors than those whose names they bear. Undoubtedly there were interpolations; for the careful separation between editorial annotations and the main body of a work is of com-

paratively recent origin, and many marginal interpretations and additions were, no doubt, introduced into the text by subsequent transcribers. But, in order for two writings by two separate authors to have been transcribed as a single writing by one author, there must have been a belief in the identity of authorship,—a belief which could hardly have sprung up at any time after the two had been known as separate compositions. In some instances, as in that of Isaiah, a strong case is indeed made from the different style of different portions. Yet does not the style of the same writer vary greatly from youth to age? But the book of Isaiah (as well as those of the prophets generally) purports to contain all the writings of the prophet through a long series of years; and on the very grounds on which portions of Isaiah are supposed to have proceeded from another hand, we might deny that the earlier and the later poems of Southey or Wordsworth were works of the same author.

It is by substantially such arguments as these that Dr. Palfrey demonstrates (and demonstration hardly seems to us too strong a word) the genuineness of the Pentateuch as written by Moses, and its virtual integrity. He shows how entirely impossible it was, at any stage of the national history, that surreptitious works, or works of doubtful authority, should have been foisted upon the confidence of the whole Hebrew nation, without leaving any traces of their doubtful reception by any tribe, sect, party, or individual. This consideration is greatly confirmed by the existence of the Samaritan Pentateuch; which carries back the date, not alone of the composition, but of the universally admitted authority of these books, to the age of Solomon, prior to which there can have been but few books, and those few could hardly have been destitute of a known history. The internal arguments for the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch are also numerous and strong. So far as we can judge of Hebrew style, these books bear marks of the highest antiquity, abounding as they do in words and grammatical forms, which had fallen out of use before the days of the prophets. Second only, if second, to this consideration is what we might term the *journalistic* style of the Pentateuch. Many transactions are recorded, just as they

would have been written down while they were in progress, and as they hardly could have been committed to writing at any subsequent period. Thus, for instance, we have many of the details of the structure and furnishing of the tabernacle described three times; first, in the Divine commands as given to Moses, then in the same commands as communicated to the people, and finally in the narrative of the work as it was wrought, in which last form alone is it conceivable that any writer subsequent to Moses would have put these details on record.

Dr. Palfrey's theory as to the purpose with which Genesis was written is, we believe, original with him, is preëminently satisfactory, and invests the book with a greater interest and higher value than can be assigned to it on any other hypothesis. He regards it not as a designed compend of the ante-Mosaic history of the world, (in which aspect it is disproportioned and fragmentary,) but rather as an historical commentary on the Levitical law. He supposes, with Eichhorn, that the book was made up, chiefly or wholly, from preëxisting documents, and contains frequently parallel and slightly discrepant accounts of the same events. These narratives Moses would have collated, sifted, and harmonized, so as to furnish only the most consistent and probable statement of facts in each instance, had he merely intended to write history. But if it had been his purpose to collect such excerpts from preëxisting traditions, oral or written, as might illustrate the importance, vindicate the justice, or confirm the authority of the ceremonial and the moral law, this end might have been answered by placing side by side narratives in the main coincident, but in part conflicting, and showing how the same lesson of expediency, truth, or duty was suggested by different versions of the story.

In this view, we can easily see that Genesis must have had a most important agency in maintaining the loyalty of the Hebrews to the law promulgated by Divine authority. It was a perpetual prophylactic against idolatry and defection. It gave in the most minute detail the very facts, ignorance concerning which had been the source of the various forms of religious superstition and moral corruption among surrounding nations. We have

space to illustrate this point with respect only to the fundamental article of religious faith,—the Divine unity. Had Moses been writing for a people who were in no danger of lapsing into false worship, we can conceive that he would have despatched the history of creation in that sublime opening sentence, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth." But it was of prime moment that he should exclude from the range of possible hypothesis, the several existing forms of idolatry. He therefore enumerates, not all classes of created objects, but the very objects which were deified in the earlier ages. He speaks of God as the creator of light and the heavenly bodies,—the first created things that arrested human homage on its way to the throne of the Omnipotent. The Egyptians worshipped various plants and animals,—leeks, birds, reptiles, crocodiles,—together with the great fertilizing agent, the Nile. Therefore Moses represented God as separating the waters from the dry land, as bringing vegetation from the bosom of the earth, and breathing life into the various tribes of animated nature. The next objects of worship, in the order of time and of probability, were the inventors of the arts that enriched, adorned, and ennobled human life. Care is therefore taken to enumerate this description of persons; and a still further caveat against their apotheosis was furnished in the fact, that most of them were of the posterity of the first murderer. Truth indeed compelled him to ascribe the original planting of the vine and manufacture of its intoxicating juice to one of the patriarchs; but his deification on that score was effectually precluded by the disgusting recital of his consequent inebriation. With a similar view, no doubt, are the genealogical details in this book given with such painstaking minuteness, so as to prevent any ancestor of any race of men from being deemed autochthonous, and revered as of celestial origin or of divine attributes.

With regard to some of the particular criticisms on the later books of the Pentateuch, we might, did our limits permit, join issue with Dr. Palfrey. But in the main, we not only admire the industry and thoroughness of his work, but assent to his conclusions. He beholds in the mission of Moses the promulgation of a religious and political system, derived from immediate revelation, not

only in its fundamental conceptions, but in the details of its ritual and regimen. Nor can the most minute provisions seem unworthy to be regarded in this light, when we take into consideration the ignorant infancy of the race, the extreme rudeness, barbarism, and degradation of the chosen people, debased by centuries of bondage, and the intense necessity of creating as many barriers as possible between them and the nations with which they might be placed in proximity. The distinctions of dress and food, the prescription of the materials of sacrifice and the forms of worship, the minute directions as to many seemingly indifferent points of domestic arrangement and mutual intercourse, all may have been in this regard of vital importance; and the reasons for many of them have been disinterred by Spencer, Michaelis, and other Biblical critics of modern times.

Dr. Palfrey regards the Pentateuch alone, of all the books of the Old Testament, as containing the records of Divine inspiration, and the miracles alleged to have been wrought in connection with the promulgation of the Law, the Exodus and wanderings of the Israelites and their establishment in Canaan, as alone authentic. The remaining historical books he supposes to have been written in good faith, but so long after the events which they describe, as to have left space for the fading away or the distortion of many essential facts, and for the growth of numerous traditions of a legendary character unworthy of credence in the form in which they have come down to us, and many of them incapable of being resolved into the nucleus of fact around which they had become accreted. He regards the promise of the Messiah as having been made through Abraham and Moses, and inseparably inwrought into the Mosaic revelation. The prophets, according to his theory, were good men, but uninspired teachers of the law, preachers, reformers, zealous religionists, earnest propagandists. They derived the materials of their respective missions from the Divine promises and threatenings to the Hebrews, and the denunciations against idolatry recorded in the Pentateuch. These materials derived the shape in which they appear in the prophetic writings, in part from the growth and modification of opinion in the national mind, and in part from the peculiar genius, culture, and environments of each

individual prophet. Many of them also were the wisest and most far-sighted men of their days, capable therefore of announcing with confidence such coming events as "cast their shadows before."

This theory might be maintained (as it is in our author's own mind), with no detriment to the Divine authority of the Christian revelation. Such speculations (even if ill-sustained) are of value, as relieving Christianity of the *onus* of accountability for all that may be found between the covers of the Old Testament. The Christian evidences are encumbered and embarrassed by their connection with Judaism. The extreme antiquity of the Hebrew Scriptures, and their isolated position in ancient literature, render it impossible to demonstrate their genuineness and credibility by the same kind of arguments which determine the authorship and prove the authenticity of the New Testament. Therefore, when the Bible is treated as an indivisible whole, which must stand or fall together, the necessarily lower and more restricted evidence for the Hebrew Scriptures tends to reduce the New Testament to the same standard of credibility, while in fact, on account of its more recent origin and the vast array of extraneous proof, it rests on intrinsically higher and surer grounds.

But the chief difficulty in the way of Dr. Palfrey's theory results from the repeated and emphatic recognition by our Saviour and his Apostles of a divine element and prophetic character, not in the Pentateuch alone, but in the Old Testament generally. This difficulty is not evaded, but is fairly met as regards every instance of quotation from the Old Testament, or reference to it, in the writings of the Evangelists and the Apostles. Sometimes it is alleged, that the Scriptures were spoken of as sacred and authoritative in a loose, colloquial style, on account of the basis of revelation on which they all rested, and the fund of inspired truth from which they drew. Sometimes Jesus, or Paul, or Peter, is represented as reasoning *ex concessis*,—as making admissions for the sake of argument alone. Then, again, many of the citations from the prophets are treated (and rightly), not as dogmatic or divine authorities, but as passages quoted from the classical literature of the nation for the purpose of illustration or rhetorical ornament.

And, finally, some of the prophetic oracles are regarded as pointing to the Messiah and his times, yet as the mere reproduction in altered forms of the germinal and constantly germinating conception of that personage, planted in the Pentateuch. Now the argument against these modes of treating references to the Old Testament in the New, is feeble and inappreciable in any one instance, but is rapidly cumulative with the multiplication of instances. That, with reference to books of so high antiquity and such various merits, even an infallible teacher should now and then have spoken in hyperbole; or that literary quotation should sometimes be so formal and solemn, as on its face to imply the peculiar sacredness of its source; or that the authority which is once or twice seemingly ascribed to a prophet was in fact ascribed not to him, but to a much earlier writer, with the spirit of whose works he had become penetrated,—all this is highly probable. But it is in the utmost degree improbable, that instances of this kind should occur on almost every page of a series of books, without a single instance in which the writers express or indicate their own actual opinions. Now, Dr. Palfrey's error, as we think, is in not estimating the cumulative force of the evidence on the subject under discussion. He takes up each separate stick in the fagot, and finds that it may be easily broken; but were he to try his strength on the whole bundle, we cannot doubt that he would desist self-refuted.

Were there insuperable objections to any theory involving the inspiration of the prophets and the distinctively Divine element in Jewish history, our only resource would be to regard just views of the Jewish Scriptures as having formed in the Divine purpose no part of the Christian revelation. On this ground we might accept the teachings of the New Testament as to life, duty, and eternity, and at the same time regard the opinions of its writers and their Divine Master, with reference to the books of the ancient covenant, as unauthorized by God, yet cleaving to them from the prejudices of education. We confess that it would greatly disturb our reverence to be compelled to take this alternative, for we love to look to Jesus as no less infallible than immaculate; and were he capable of mistake even on matters not directly

concerning us or his mission, it would be the less easy to lean upon him in implicit, self-surrendering faith. But it does concern us to know the true character of the Old Testament; for there must be filaments of unity pervading all divine revelations, and the less perfect may help us in the interpretation of the more perfect, by enabling us to trace the "grace and truth" incarnated in Jesus through the earlier stages of their development. We therefore not only dissent from Dr. Palfrey's view of the later Hebrew Scriptures, but cannot help feeling, also, that by this view Christianity is bereft of some of the best helps for its exposition, as well as of an important class of its evidences. But we most of all deprecate this view, because we believe that it can satisfy very few minds. Dr. Palfrey's interpretations of some of the more important references in the New Testament to the Old, seem to us so unnatural and improbable, that we can hardly anticipate their general reception; and the way may therefore have been prepared for some of his readers to take lower views of the infallibility of Jesus, and the reliableness of the Christian Scriptures, than those which are presented in these volumes, and are constantly maintained by their author.

In our apprehension, the inspiration of the prophets has a strong antecedent probability in its favor. The doctrine of immortality formed no part of the Mosaic revelation. The chief hold which the moral precepts and religious dogmas of the Pentateuch retained upon the Hebrew mind was through the complicated and imposing ritual service. In seasons of national declension and misfortune this service was impaired or suspended; and with its partial or entire disuse, the faith which it embodied and symbolized seems to have faded from the popular mind, and to have demanded for its restoration the Divine interposition, in ways not dissimilar to those in which it was at first established. The "digni vindice nodi" were thus frequently recurring; and it was at precisely these exigencies that the prophets made their appearance and uttered their alleged messages from Jehovah. Moreover, it cannot be doubted that the prophets were honest men. Their sublime devotion, their indomitable heroism, their unshrinking self-sacrifice, their fulness of the martyr spirit, are utterly incon-

sistent with the hypothesis that they resorted to pious fraud to win a hearing. But they speak in the name of Jehovah. They profess to receive in visions and revelations from Heaven the commands, promises, and denunciations which form the burden of their writings. They utter many predictions which were not expressed or implied in the Pentateuch,—many things, for which, if they had any authority, it must have been derived from direct inspiration. Unless they believed that they enjoyed immediate communication with the Most High, it was a breach of common honesty for them constantly to have spoken and written in his name. Were they deluded by their own enthusiasm? This seems hardly possible, when we consider that they were, most of them, not recluses, but active men, constantly before the people, confronting kings and popular assemblies, and often wielding an influence over the great heart of the nation, which in ages of scepticism could hardly have been conceded to fanatical day-dreamers or men of unsound intellect. That the Divine communications were given in precisely the form in which they have been transmitted to us, we by no means contend. The prophets undoubtedly clothed their messages in their own peculiar style, grouped around them such imagery as was adapted to give them the greater impressiveness for the time being, blended with them the circumstances under which they were given, and their own concurrent reflections and imaginings, and often selected for them such symbolical forms of communication as were adapted to the rude habits of their age, rather than to the ideas of congruity and adequacy which belong to a period of higher culture. We thus "have the treasure in earthen vessels,"—a large commingling of the human element with the divine.

Our views of the inspiration of the prophets are confirmed by the undoubted fulfilment of many of their predictions. We cannot help tracing many and striking coincidences between their representations of the Messiah and his times, and the history of our Saviour and his religion. Beneath the gorgeous Orientalism of their prophecies there are traits of the Gospel dispensation and its Author, which indicate a clearer and more adequate conception of the glorious future than could

have been derived from the Pentateuch, or could have grown up in their own minds without inspiration from Heaven. Then, again, as to the fortunes of their own nation, of Babylon, Tyre, Sidon, and Idumæa and other surrounding states, their predictions in numerous instances present too close an accordance with subsequent history to have been the result of fortuitous conjecture, or even of the profoundest wisdom and the keenest foresight.

Similar considerations apply to the miracles recorded in the later books of the Old Testament. Miracles are, indeed, said to have been wrought on some occasions, on which the Divine interposition seems improbable. Nor do we deem it an untenable supposition, that some legendary matter of this sort may have become incorporated with authentic history. But this is rendered probable only on the supposition that actual miracle entered largely into the fortunes of the Hebrew commonwealth. The counterfeit implies the existence and currency of the genuine coin. There is no surer testimony to the reasonableness and reality of supernatural phenomena, than the tendency to exalt ordinary occurrences into supernatural. But it may be that in cases of this sort we know only a part of the attending circumstances, which, if we knew them in full, would attach strong credibility to the very miracles to which we give the most reluctant credence. Or it may well be that our race in its infancy needed Divine interpositions, which, because they were needful, were worthy of infinite wisdom, though in our more advanced stage of culture they seem superfluous; and if so, it is only a mark of authenticity that the miraculous narratives of the Old Testament should seem adapted to the then current age, and not to the taste and judgment of long subsequent generations. Is it alleged that in some cases the recorded miracles and their occasions are so fully described, as to show them to have been of the most trivial character, and thus utterly to exclude the possibility of the special agency of Jehovah? Here the only question is, Were these occasions and events trivial to the persons concerned in them? Newton, had he been teaching an infant, would not have read to the child passages from his *Principia*; but would have written letters on blocks and cards, have connected\* the first lessons of philosophy

with toys and games, and have risen to more manly vehicles of communication only as the child advanced towards man's estate. That during the age-long childhood of the human family God is represented in the Old Testament as having dealt with men as with children, is one of the strongest considerations which conciliate our faith for its records. Whatever could restrain, guide, refine, and exalt the intellect of man in the earlier stages of its growth,—whatever could insinuate religious conceptions among the coarsenesses and pettinesses of those rude times,—has the strongest intrinsic probability in its favor.

But there are many of the miraculous narratives of the later Hebrew Scriptures, which chime in full harmony with our loftiest views of the Divine attributes and government, and are their own best evidence. The supernatural events which they describe are such works as constrain belief from their majestic simplicity, from the momentousness of the occasions on which they were wrought, and from their adaptation to produce vast results on the belief and conduct of nations. Take, for instance, Elijah's sacrifice upon Mount Carmel. Were we to encounter that story in any ancient book, it seems to us that we could hardly help believing it, so utterly impossible does it appear that a puerile fancy should have drawn such sublime figures on so vast a canvas. How grand the form, how full of divine inspiration the features, of that noble old prophet, standing forth alone before that idolatrous nation! There are the eight hundred and fifty priests of Baal, and the groves. There are king and people, all arrayed on their side. They are assembled on the craggy summit and brow of Carmel, towering over its background of rough, lofty hills, projecting far out into the deep, and bathing its foot in the waters of the Great Sea. Elijah stands alone, calm, self-collected, lofty, a not unmeet impersonation of the law uttered amid the thunderings and fearful voices of Sinai. He leaves the chattering multitude to mutter, shout, and shriek their prayers to the senseless idol. From morning to midday, from midday till the time of evening sacrifice, he waits for them to desist from the vain endeavor to awaken their gods. He then builds his altar, makes ready the sacrifice, and, that the miracle may appear be-

yond a question, drenches it with water from the mountain brook. Then goes up his simple prayer of faith, no far-sought form, no labored invocation, but the appeal as of one who lived near heaven and knew who answered prayer. And, as the fire of God falls upon the thrice-drenched altar, the hearts of the people are turned back from idol worship; and, as the multitudinous shout of Jehovah's praise goes forth from that bold, far-looking promontory, we seem to hear it echoed from the surrounding mountains and the distant waters: "The sea is his, and he made it; the strength of the hills is his also."

Similar in grandeur, and in every element that seems to warrant and confirm the Divine interposition, is that scene on the plain of Dura, where the three children of the captivity, failing to bow before the image set up by Nebuchadnezzar, are cast into the furnace seven times heated, and there walks with them in the flames a god-like form, the symbol and pledge of the Divine interposition, to own and reward their loyalty. This miracle is certainly alleged to have been wrought at a crisis of intense need, and to have been attended by results of adequate importance. Whether it turned the tide of Babylonish idolatry for more than the briefest period, we cannot, indeed, say. But it was adapted to sustain the faith and elevate the hope of the captive Hebrews. Its memory must have lingered in their hearts through the years of their exile, and have given them courage to "sing the Lord's song in a strange land." It must have entered (how largely none can tell) into the elements of belief and sentiment which saved the nation from subsequent apostasy, inspired the heroism and sustained the fortitude of the Maccabees and their associates, and preserved the worship of the one God among a nation everywhere scattered abroad, till their dispersion among the Gentiles became the means of diffusing a religion designed for all men, and destined to outlive the ages of human history.

We might, had we space, specify many other narratives, which in like manner vindicate their own authenticity, and strongly enlist the religious sentiment in favor of their literal truth.

We have indicated important points, on which Dr. Palfrey's book has found us dissentients, and left us un-

convinced. But, independently of these mooted questions, and for those who agree the least with him in his answers to them, this work has a value, which will be only the more appreciated by use and with the lapse of time. We have been especially interested in the lecture on the Book of Job. We have long supposed it the oldest book in the canon, and written before the establishment of the Levitical worship, to which it makes not a single reference; and we are glad to have our opinion confirmed from so reliable a source. Dr. Palfrey believes it to have been the work of Moses; and, unwilling to close our article without a single extract, we quote entire the argument for its antiquity and its probable authorship.

"The book does not declare who was its author, nor have we any credible historical information on that point. He must have been a person to whom the Hebrew tongue was vernacular, for the purity, copiousness, and elegance of his Hebrew style—and that, too, the Hebrew style of poetry—absolutely repel the supposition that the work was a translation from any other language.

"The time when he wrote is the next question that occurs. It seems to me that the opinion of those critics has no small probability, who regard the book as the oldest in the Biblical collection, and accordingly, as far as we know, the most ancient book in existence.

"In favor of a modern origin, two arguments have been presented. Some supposed Chaldee forms of language have been referred to, as indicating a date for the composition as late as the time when the Jews came into political relations with Babylon; but I believe no *Chaldaisms* have been pointed out which are not equally well accounted for as *Arabisms*, which latter forms of speech betoken a very early, instead of a modern, origin.

"And a similar argument has been drawn from the mention of *Satan* in the introduction, erroneously supposed to be that great Evil Spirit of whom the Jews knew nothing till, at the time of the captivity, they adopted some superstitions of the Chaldeans. Such an inference rests on a mere confusion of ideas, growing out of an accidental similarity of terms. The *Satan* of the first two chapters of Job is by no means the *Ahriman*, the Prince of Darkness, the Devil, the *Satan*, of the Oriental mythology, afterwards transferred to the mythology of the Jews, and from them to that of the Christians. Job's *Satan* is a 'sociable spirit,' one of 'the sons of God,' who on a day of high ceremony comes to present himself among his associate splendors 'before the Lord,' and

with whom the Lord holds gracious discourse. *Satan* was not originally a proper name. It only became so by a particular appropriation to a new idea of foreign origin, just as the Hebrew was going out of use as a spoken language. Satan is a generic word, signifying *an adversary*, and repeatedly rendered by that English word in the common version of the Old Testament; and the ‘son of God’ spoken of in the passage in question is called a *Satan*, simply in his character of *the adversary* of Job.

“The writer, whoever he was, was well acquainted with the scenery and natural objects of Arabia and Egypt, for these furnish the *commonplaces* of his poetical imagery. He appears also to have at least heard of the river Jordan; but there is no such reference to the geography or natural history of Palestine as would indicate him to have been an inhabitant, or even a visitor, of that country.

“One fact, taken in connection with those which have been mentioned, is very remarkable. While the purity and freedom of the language and style incontestably prove the work to have been the composition of a native Hebrew, and no translation from a foreign original, there is no other indication from beginning to end of its having been written by a Jew. It is stamped with none of those peculiarities of the Jewish mind which were formed by the Law of Moses. It contains no reference to the Jewish ritual or history. It alludes to no king, no priests, no tabernacle, no temple. The all-pervading Jewish idea of the *royalty* of God is never presented. It is not enough to say, in answer to this remark, that the scene is laid, not in Judea, but in a foreign country. We seem to know enough of Jewish habits of thought, to make it matter of surprise that no traces of them should appear in a long and sustained composition like this, from a Hebrew source.

“At what time could a Jew have lived, writing his mother tongue in perfect purity, and with extraordinary force, and yet capable of writing as if absolutely ignorant of the national ritual and history? I think, only before a Jewish Law and a Jewish nation existed. And in accordance with this theory of the high antiquity of the book is the fact, that, while the Hebrew language changed but little during the ten centuries over which the Old Testament collection extends, we seem to find indications of its most ancient form in the phraseology of this composition. It is observed that several expressions occur in it, which are scarcely or never to be found elsewhere, except in the Pentateuch; that, on the other hand, forms of speech, found in the later books, but not in the Pentateuch, are rarely or never found in the Book of Job; and that, finally, it has some words peculiar to itself, which appear to have gone into disuse before the later Old Testament books were written.

"In the earliest Jewish mention of the book that has come down to our times, it is ascribed to Moses as its author; and this opinion prevailed with the Greek and Syrian fathers. The opinion of writers in an age so recent, as compared with that of the production of the work, carries with it but little historical authority. And yet, in the absence of better proof, I am strongly inclined to give it attention, and to suppose that Moses wrote the book during his sojourn in Midian, between the time of his flight from Egypt and his summons to return thither for his people's deliverance.

"The facts of the case accord well with that view. In his solitude, and in the mood of mind incident to his circumstances, it was natural that the great problem discussed in the Book of Job should present itself to his thoughts, while, as yet unenlightened by any revelation, he possessed no advantages for its solution, beyond other men. His place of exile was near the country of Idumæa, where the scene of the Book of Job is placed. He was living in the midst of Arabian scenery and manners; and he had lived, till he was forty years of age, in the midst of those of Egypt; to both of which the book abundantly refers. Respecting Palestine, where Moses had never been, it is silent, except that it once refers to one great feature of the geography of that country, the river Jordan, an object so considerable in connection with the former abode of his fathers, that Moses could not be supposed to be uninformed of it. The word *Jehovah*, the proper name of the Supreme Being, occurs repeatedly in the prose parts, and once, perhaps, in the poetry. Moses was acquainted with the name, for it had been known to his ancestors, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; but it is to be presumed that it would not be in so familiar and constant use with him as with a writer subsequent to the period when Jehovah, under that name, gave the people a law, and adopted them for his own. And supposing the book to have been a production, antecedently to the Law, of the great lawgiver, Moses, we have an explanation of the fact, otherwise extremely perplexing, that a work, having nothing whatever to do with Jewish religion, politics, morals, history, manners, or any other national interest or subject, should have been adopted with such a welcome, preserved with such care, and regarded with such veneration, by that people. A work attributed to the great founder and lawgiver would have peculiar claims to estimation and reverence.

"If to this opinion the objection occurs, that, had the work proceeded from Moses, it might have been expected that a uniform Jewish tradition would have placed that fact beyond doubt, it is to be remembered, on the other hand, that, in the early times, at least, the Jews were not readers, and that this book, considering

its subject, was very likely to be preserved only in the hands of the curious and learned; that the other writings of Moses were mainly important to his countrymen, and maintained their free circulation among them, as memorials of history and documents of law, while the Book of Job, being neither the one nor the other, might be left comparatively out of view; and that it may even have suffered a degree of neglect from being regarded as at most only a vague speculation of the great legislator while as yet in a semi-heathen state.

"If we could know that Moses wrote the book, and that he wrote it under the circumstances at which I have hinted, we should have further light upon its design. He was in Midian as an exile from Egypt, where he had left his wretched countrymen oppressed by cruel taskmasters. The once brilliant fortunes of his race were changed for degradation and despair. The hand of sorrow, and, as it seemed, the avenging hand of God, was heavy upon them. Why was it thus with them? What had they done to merit such a visitation? To his patriotic feelings, made more tender by absence from his fellow-sufferers, and by compassion for their lot, it seemed that they had not provoked, by any gross ill-desert, such a grievous chastisement from God. Why, then, had it been permitted to come upon them? How was it consistent with God's righteousness, that he should so severely afflict the innocent?

"This is the problem with which the mind of Moses, under the circumstances related in the history, must be supposed to have been exercised in the solitude of his sojourn near to the land of Uz. And this is the problem — stated, it is true, with reference to an individual, and not to a nation, but in its principles the same — which is discussed in the Book of Job. It is altogether consonant with probability, that Moses, musing on this subject under the circumstances described, should throw his thoughts into this form, and that, in that concluding discourse of Jehovah, in which are exposed the folly and rashness of presuming to question or to explain his proceedings, it was the purpose of Moses to quiet the discontents of his countrymen, — those chosen of Jehovah, whom Jehovah seemed now to have cast off, — by enforcing on them a lesson of unmurmuring submission to the Divine will, and quickening the hope of a future exaltation, through the restored favor of God, to a prosperity even greater than the past."

— Vol. IV. pp. 246–252.

The lectures on the Psalms also will be found rich in materials for their history, their classification, their criticism as poems, and their interpretation as devotional compositions. We would also commend the lectures

on the Apocrypha, as containing in a succinct form much valuable information, which lies wholly out of the reach of the non-professional reader, and indeed could be furnished by few private theological libraries. But there is no need of multiplying specifications of this sort. We can find in the whole work no traces whatever of inadequate research, scanty scholarship, or careless execution. The author always commands our highest respect, and, except where his conclusions are affected by his peculiar theories, our cordial confidence. We give him, on the appearance of these two new volumes, our hearty welcome back to the *curriculum* in which he won his first laurels,—laurels which at least one grateful pupil would fain keep ever green for him, even should he again lose thought of them in the dust and turmoil of forensic strife.

A. P. P.

#### ART. II.—THE CHRIST OF THE APOCRYPHAL GOSPELS.\*

A CANON is a rule: in ecclesiastical matters, a rule of discipline; in doctrinal matters, a rule of faith. The canon of Scripture is that collection of writings which the Church has decreed to be of authority in all points of belief. A canonical book is one that is included in this collection. An apocryphal book is one that has been excluded from it, and is therefore of no authority in questions of doctrine. That is the whole difference between so-called apocryphal and canonical writings. According to Dr. Hofmann, the term *apocryphal* applies to "all those productions, which by title and contents claim to possess whatever is demanded of canonical writings, but to which the Church, on the ground of doubtful origin or of heterodox opinion, has refused a place in the canon." This definition takes in another point, namely, the reasons which decided whether a book should be an

\* *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apocryphen.* Von RUDOLPH HOFMANN, Dr. Phil. und Nachmittags Prediger an der Universitätskirche zu Leipzig. 8vo. 1851.

*The Life of Jesus according to the Apocrypha.* By RUDOLPH HOFMANN, Doctor in Philosophy and Afternoon Preacher at the University Church in Leipzig. 8vo. 1851.

authority in faith or not. These are two: first, its doubtful authorship; second, its heterodox opinions. The historical origin of the New Testament canon is wrapped in obscurity so dense, that little can be said positively respecting the grounds of its compilation. It can be affirmed, however, with some emphasis, that the first class of considerations had no decisive weight. The genuineness of a book did not, in fact, secure for it a place in the authorized canon, nor did its spuriousness deprive it of a place there. The Gospel of the Hebrews put forward a very strong claim to be considered genuine, and was so considered until near the middle of the second century. Yet it gained no admission into the canon, but was expressly declared heretical. On the other hand, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the second Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, the Apocalypse, and other books, are found in our collections, though the best scholars have, from the earliest times, inclined to the opinion that they were not the production of those whose names they bear. The genuineness of a writing, therefore, was no sure test of its canonicity; even its reputed genuineness was not. We shall see, by and by, how much weight was attached to the character of its doctrine.

An apocryphal book is one that for any cause whatever has been excluded from that collection of sacred writings which we now possess, under the common name of the New Testament. The number of such was great. Fabricius counted fifty titles, and thinks there might have been forty separate Gospels, some of which had more than one name. Many of these were in substance doctrinal, with one or two historical points casually inserted. Others, with more or less of doctrinal matter, professed to tell the story, or portions of the story of Jesus, in regular narrative order. For the most part these writings exist now in small fragments. But the following Dr. Hofmann mentions as preserved entire.  
1. The Protevangelium of James the Less: embracing the time from the announcement of Mary's birth to the massacre of the infants at Bethlehem: in twenty-five chapters. 2. The Gospel of the Holy Mary's Nativity: embracing the period from the announcement of Mary's birth to the birth of Jesus: in ten chapters. 3. The History of Mary's Nativity and of the Saviour's Infancy:

embracing the period from the announcement of Mary's birth to the arrival of the holy family in Egypt: in twenty-four chapters. 4. The History of Joseph the Carpenter: containing the whole biography of Joseph till his death: in thirty-two chapters. 5. The Gospel of the Infancy of the Saviour: embracing the time from the birth of Jesus till his visit to the temple at the age of twelve years: in fifty-five chapters. 6. The Gospel of Thomas the Israelite: embracing the period from the fifth to the twelfth year of Jesus's life: in nineteen chapters. Besides these so-called Gospels of the Infancy, Dr. Hofmann has used the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, as edited by Dr. Tischendorf: the Gospel of the Boyhood of Jesus according to Thomas; and a book called the "Suggramma Thomæ," which Tischendorf published in the Wiener Jahrbücher of 1846. Such are the materials for this life of Jesus; materials for the most part fragmentary and loose, not easily compacted or moulded together. And from these, piecing them out as he can, the author attempts to construct something like a consistent narrative. He has done his work well, with ability and learning. His object in writing such a book was, he tells us, to furnish rich materials for dogmatic and antiquarian research; to show the relation of the apocryphal to the canonical Gospels, and their value in illustrating them; and to throw some light upon the circumstances, the mental and moral causes, which gave birth to these productions. This he has done in long notes appended to each section, full of curious information, and, to say the least, very suggestive. A further end Dr. Hofmann seems to have had in view, namely, to contrast the apocryphal and the canonical Gospels. He is persuaded that such a comparison will force upon candid readers the conviction, that so great a difference could exist only between man's work and God's work. He is acquainted with no more excellent way of stimulating thirst for the pure milk of the Gospel, than this of letting men drink to the full such unpalatable waters as these. His study of the apocryphal Gospels, he assures us, has been a long one, and the chief profit from it this: that he has learned to value the true Gospel as his life's dearest treasure, to hold fast by it as the only anchor of faith, and to draw from it as the only fountain of life. This, and much

more in the same strain, we find in the Preface. But even if the author said nothing to this effect, his book would declare some little predispositions of the sort. One's own theological opinions cannot materially affect a work of this character. Still Dr. Hofmann's conservative and orthodox tendencies are by no means concealed. They occasionally affect his view of historical evidence, and often they disturb the perfect fairness of his critical judgment. He is anxious to hold fast whatever may be received as authentic, and at the same time to mark distinctly the limits of the legendary and the mythical. In doing this, he is rather inclined to be credulous. He is disposed, for example, to believe that the captain of the guard reported to Pilate the wonderful incidents that attended the crucifixion of Christ, and that Pilate issued a proclamation thereupon, calling together the Sanhedrim, to whom he addressed a sharp and stern speech; all which, though it may seem very probable, has no historical countenance whatever. But these are slight blemishes. The work in general must be pronounced learned and liberal. And if it is not as interesting or instructive as we might expect to find it, that is mainly our fault, or the fault of the subject, certainly not of Dr. Hofmann, who has made a curious and valuable book, if not an amusing one.

Before treating, as we mean to do briefly, of the rules and methods upon which the apocryphal histories were constructed, a few general remarks may not be out of place. If we apprehend the true definition of the term *apocryphal*,—if we consider that the books it applies to may possibly have been excluded upon some purely local ground,—if we remember that writings having no more claim to Apostolic origin than the Gospel of Nicodemus or the Protevangelium of James have found their way into our Bibles,—we shall be much more tolerant of that unwelcome word, and shall deal with the literature it designates in a more candid spirit. These writings were not “fictions” or “forgeries”; they were not “pious frauds,” designed to impose upon the Church a false history or a corrupt faith. A literary “forgery,” as we understand it, is impossible, where there is no just idea of history or historical criticism. And in that early age there was none. Books were written to set forth some

peculiar views in theology or piety ; they had a practical aim, — sometimes didactic, sometimes controversial ; and whoever wrote them sent them out under the name of some distinguished leader or teacher of those views. It was not asserted, it was not even implied, that the person whose name the book bore was of course its real author. The title indicated, not the composer of the work, but either the subject or the eyewitness of the history, if it was historical ; or, if it was doctrinal, the class of opinions therein contained and defended,—the opinions with which that name was associated. There could be no imputation of fraud. There was no artifice, no contrivance, no attempt to pass off a thing for what it was not. Criticism did not ask, “ Is the book genuine ? ” Only speculative faith asked, “ Is it true as dogma ? ” As in all literature each distinguished representative mind has had a school of disciples who translated and explained its thought, so here certain Apostolical names represented current tendencies of speculation, and when a book appeared bearing one of these names, its character was understood at once.

If we ask for the causes that gave birth to such a vast number of un-genuine productions, some of them contemporaneous with our Gospels, and one or two even older, they lie immediately on the surface. It was natural that Christians in the first two centuries should want some standard of authority, some fuller exposition of Apostolical teaching than the writings in their possession afforded. They desired to know the opinions of Jesus and of his followers on more points, and in more detail, in order to meet the questions and satisfy the mental demands which each generation brought up. Truth must be unfolded progressively, by the continual movement of thought. Besides, radical controversies existed from the beginning among the orthodox believers themselves. There was the party of Paul, with its liberal tendencies. There was the party of Peter, with its conservative Jewish tendencies. These two sects carried on a perpetual discussion for many years, in the course of which numerous productions appeared on either side. What is Christian truth ? This was the great question for a century and a half. No means existed for answering it finally to the satisfaction of any one generation. Each age, there-

fore, was compelled to make an answer for itself, connecting its thought as well as it could with the original traditions. To this end, these books which we call apocryphal, and others which bear no such name of reproach, were written. Christ had promised the "Spirit" to all his disciples. By the "Spirit" they were to be guided into all truth. Every Christian, therefore, who believed himself moved by the Spirit, who was persuaded that he saw the truth, felt at perfect liberty to publish his Gospel. Nay, in his own judgment, he was not only capable of writing, and justified in writing, but he was even bound to write as a sacred duty, since in this way he extended the views and advanced the work of the Apostles. He aided in building up the Church; he hastened the time when there should be one faith. Until this time drew nigh, it was every Christian's duty to labor in the Apostles' name and spirit, and even to be an apostle himself. It was incumbent on him to penetrate to the inmost mind and heart of his chosen teacher, and with fresh power and breadth to expound, enforce, and apply his original doctrine. Thus, as the Spirit was one, as it could neither mislead others nor contradict itself, it was hoped that the truth would in time be elicited and established.

With this general purpose, earnestly and seriously, never in a trifling mood, though often wanting dignity both of subject and of treatment, were all apocryphal books written; and with the same liberal understanding of their intent were they received. The Spirit prompted them. The Spirit judged them. The test of their orthodoxy was the Spirit. It being the common persuasion that every Christian possessed the Spirit of Truth, a book was criticized by the tone of thought which prevailed when it was written. If it fell in with the dominant Christian consciousness, it was accepted; otherwise, not. The question of genuineness was rarely debated. Not many were interested in it: very few were competent judges of it, in that age of faith. The standard of heresy, not the rules of scientific criticism, decided the authority of a writing. Setting aside all question of authorship, if one recognized in a document truth which commended itself to his own reason, he accepted it as Apostolical. It was possible, therefore, that, until the

canon of Scripture was closed, the same book might be rejected in one age and received in another. And this we find to have been the case. We will give one or two instances. Irenæus speaks of some who repudiated the fourth Gospel, on account of its Montanistic tendencies. The Apocalypse of John underwent many changes of fortune, was alternately welcomed and discarded, as this or that opinion ruled in the Church, but was finally received as canonical. On the other side, both Origen and Jerome tell us how writings unquestionably spurious were accepted as authoritative; as, for example, the Epistle to the Hebrews, Jude, the Second of Peter, the Second and Third of John, with others. Justin refers to the Sibylline Oracles and the Prophecies of Hystaspes, as coming from divine suggestion. Irenæus quotes the Shepherd of Hermas as an inspired writing, seeing, doubtless, in its dull visions some dim revelations of his own prejudices. Clement of Alexandria not only makes most honorable mention of the same production, but regards the "Preaching of Peter" as entirely authentic and canonical, comments upon the "Revelation of Peter" as if it were a catholic document, and counts the Sibylline Oracles among inspired books. The same Father believes in the Apostolical authorship of the Letters of Barnabas and of Clemens Romanus. Origen calls the Letter of Barnabas a catholic letter, speaks more than once with respect of the "Acts of Paul," and quotes the Clementine Recognitions as a genuine composition of the Roman Clement. Lactantius appeals to the Sibylline Oracles. Eusebius confesses that the Second Epistle of Peter was used because it was profitable (*οὐμως δὲ πολλοῖς χρήσιμος φανεῖσα*). Athanasius cites the Shepherd of Hermas as "that very profitable book in which the Christian faith speaks." Epiphanius expressly maintains the true apostolical origin and canonicity of the "Constitutiones Apostolici," and considers them inspired. Fathers of the Church later than Epiphanius esteemed very highly these Apostolical Constitutions. They continued long in the use of the Oriental churches; and were first publicly rejected, and then not as unguine, but as heterodox, by the second Trullan Council, so called, which was convened at Constantinople in the year 691.

Such are only a few of the examples which might be given, to show how little criticism had to do with settling the authority of a book in those ancient times. In every case we have mentioned, the criterion was doctrinal. The writing which commended itself to the Christian belief of its day was true, canonical, apostolical. It is well known that each conspicuous sect, whether orthodox or heterodox, had its favorite Gospels, and did not hesitate to depreciate such as contained opinions at variance with its own, however well authenticated they might be. Martin Luther, in rejecting the Epistle of James, as "an epistle of straw," because it gave no countenance to his doctrine of Justification, was only following an old example. Had he wanted authority, he could have found it in the most distinguished scholars of the Church.

At length, after many years, no one knows when or how, a tendency towards harmony prevailed; opposing views, having gone to extremes, began to approach each other; a cast of opinion, not pure, but mixed, came to predominate among Christians, and the canon of Scripture was closed. It embraced in its limits many incongruous books, some genuine, others not; it contained several types of doctrine. This, too, we should have expected. Perhaps this very comprehensiveness was deemed a merit. A generous spirit of eclecticism may have suggested the compilation. At all events, the genius of scientific criticism never presided over the making of that rule of faith.

After the canon was closed, the composition of works in the name of Apostles became less common. In fact, from the middle of the second century this kind of literary activity declined, through the want of an adequate motive. Its chief work was done. No more expositions were called for. The utterances of the Spirit upon the most momentous truths could not be longer listened to, and so became silent. But not wholly dumb. Many things were to be said yet: and books were still written, though fewer, shorter, and of less ambitious purpose. On many points of history, and of doctrine, too, curiosity asked for satisfaction. Local tenets wanted a basis in tradition: and traditions must be made to bear some fruit of doctrine. Then, during a long series of years,

and under every kind of literary and religious motive, what we term the Apocryphal Gospels were written. These books owed their existence to as pious and serious a mind as that which produced the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Apocalypse. They were not forgeries, or frauds, but honest, well-meaning attempts to supply a conscious deficiency in some department of belief. In certain quarters these books were received as authoritative. The Protevangelium of James was publicly read in the Oriental churches, as the production of James, the brother of Jesus. We learn from Thilo that the Gospel of Nicodemus was famous in the Latin Church till a late period, and was well known to Christians in the East. Many of these productions were in use and favor even in the sixth and seventh centuries, notwithstanding the canon was closed. The most distinguished of the Church Fathers did not disdain to use them as approved writings. The purpose of such writings was sometimes doctrinal or ecclesiastical; as, for instance, the "History of Joseph the Carpenter," which Thilo thinks was composed with a view to recommend a certain festival by the authority of Jesus; and the "Gospel of the Nativity of Mary," whose design, according to the same scholar, was to maintain against the Manicheans that Mary was descended from the line of David. Other books seem to have been historical only. It is with these, and with their historical aspect, that we are at present concerned.

Regarding the apocryphal Gospels as containing a life of Jesus, we are first constrained to ask on what principles this biographical portion was constructed. Whence came the facts? Before replying to this question, which carries us into the very heart of Dr. Hofmann's book, and opens to us many alluring trains of thought, we must be permitted to assert again, that, for a period of three or four hundred years,—yes, and for very much longer than that,—the principles of scientific criticism were not at all understood, and were scarcely thought of. There was no historical investigation of facts according to our modern methods. Men of reflection and learning gave credit to the strangest things, and resorted to the most extraordinary reasonings. Irenæus, for example, argues that there must be four Gospels, because there are four regions of the globe and four principal winds. The

Church covers the whole earth, and the Gospel is the foundation of the Church, therefore there must be a four-fold Gospel. Tertullian holds fast to the fable that John was plunged into a caldron of boiling oil, and came out unscathed. Jerome tells the story about the cave in which Jesus was born, and the ox and ass that recognized him as the Lord. Many of the Church Fathers, Origen and Eusebius among them, believed an idle tale that the gods of Egypt fell and broke in the presence of the infant Christ. Chrysostom was not ashamed to repeat the legend which related how water drawn from the Jordan on the night of Christ's baptismal day would preserve for two or three years the mysterious virtue which his body imparted to it. It is said to have been a custom among the Catholics, and even among the Protestants, to resort to the charmed river for water on this solemn anniversary. Eusebius believed that Christ, after his ascension, despatched one of his disciples to heal Abgarus. Justin Martyr tells how a miraculous light filled the cave in which Christ was born, and a host of angels sung, "Glory to God in the highest!" Augustine in a sermon says: "Deus per angelum loquebatur, et Virgo per aurem impregnabatur." So Bernard: "Missus est Gabriel a Deo, ut verbum patris per aurem Virginis," etc. And the following strain was sung on Christmas day: "Sancta Dei genitrix quæ concepisti per aurem Dominum nostrum." Men like Ambrose, Augustine, and St. Bernard even undertook to say at what particular word in the angel's greeting the life-giving spirit entered the Virgin's ear. Such things prove clearly enough that the very idea of scientific criticism was foreign to these authors. They judged of facts by another criterion than historical evidence. There was no trial of witnesses. Faith was very large, and did not care to discriminate. Imagination had free play in the region of the supernatural, its pious inventions passing unchallenged except by such as had a special interest in rejecting, or no motive aside from their credibility in accepting them.

We are not surprised, in such a state of mental confusion, to find whole histories constructed elaborately out of the fancy, and yet credited by large bodies of Christians. Such for the most part were the so-called Apocryphal Gospels. Two general principles seem to have

conspired in the production of the narrative portions of these books. One was the desire to fill up gaps or remove discrepancies in the canonical Gospels, and thus make their story complete. The other was a wish to fulfil all the prophecies in the Old Testament, by having ready a fact for every fancied prediction. The operation of these principles will be best shown by a few examples.

The Gospel history is fragmentary. Whole passages in the life of Jesus are passed over in silence; for instance, his childhood and youth, and the time that elapsed between his resurrection and his ascension. How did Jesus grow up? What were his occupations and tastes, — how was he regarded at home, by his parents and neighbors, — did he laugh, — did he play, — did he mingle with the boys of his age, — did he go to school, — was he conscious of his destiny, — did he exhibit any extraordinary wisdom, any miraculous power, — did he work at a trade? These were natural questions. Curiosity also seized upon recorded incidents in his biography, and demanded information. It wanted to know the private history of the immaculate birth; what transpired during the journey to Egypt, and there; whether Jesus was circumcised. It asked how his trial was conducted, who were his judges, and a thousand similar things, not forgetting to claim the solution of all historical doubts and disagreements. Such questions will find answers. Fancy is never slow to gratify inquisitiveness; and inquisitiveness will not be dainty if it only can be satisfied. It seems, accordingly, as if every possible query in regard to Christ was met in these apocryphal Gospels with the most innocent fearlessness. To give some instances. Jesus passed through no embryonic development: he was "vir perfectus in utero." Jesus, yet in the womb, heals the withered hand of an unbelieving nurse. While lying in swaddling-clothes, he says to his mother, "I am Jesus, the Son of God, the Logos, whom the Father has sent to save the world." As an infant he was a perfect man. Jesus goes to school and confounds his teacher. He performs the most surprising miracles. On his return from Egypt, he cures the sick and leprous, raises the dead, makes clay sparrows fly, carries water in his apron, stretches out a large throne which his father had made too short, transforms his companions into goats, and

exhibits many other works, all equally marvellous, not all humane, some of them very cruel. He is described as the centre and virtual head of his father's household. No one ventured to eat or drink, or to seat himself at the table, or to break bread, until Jesus had done it before him. If he was absent, they waited for his return. If he was not hungry, the family dispensed with the meal. The subjects of his conversation with the doctors in the temple are reported in full. The discussion, it seems, turned upon the Messiah, the Scriptures, the divine mysteries of the prophets. He told the wise men about the heavenly bodies, their number, nature, and laws. He unfolded the secrets of natural philosophy, talked of temperaments, limbs, bones, veins, arteries, and nerves, and explained the mutual action of soul and body. It may be noted, by the way, as a curiosity, that in the year 1203 a book of seventy-eight octavo pages, without designation of place, appeared, containing an account of this interview in all its particulars, "by a Hebrew who was present." So far will curiosity go. The story of the flight into Egypt is told with the utmost minuteness of detail. Every thing is explained. The palm-tree bends down its branches and offers its fruit to the hungry travellers, and a spring of cool water bubbles from its roots to slake their thirst. Wild beasts escort the holy family, robbers of the desert flee before them. But the way to Egypt is long. Perhaps it was difficult to invent miracles enough to beguile it; Jesus therefore shortens the distance, so that the journey of thirty days is accomplished in one. "Straightway the mountains of Egypt came in sight." In a wilderness, as they are travelling, the wonderful pilgrims fall in with the two robbers who were afterwards crucified with Jesus; their names Titus and Dumachus. Titus bribes Dumachus to let the strangers pass unmolested, and Jesus predicts his blessed fate on the spot. These stories are all pure fictions. But they are fictions designed for a purpose. Curiosity called for them. Credulity accepted them.

Let us take some larger and more striking illustrations of this mode of constructing history out of imagination. The miraculous conception offered a very tempting field for the exercise of the inventive faculty. The importance attached to it as a fact by Christians generally, and the

extreme difficulty of certifying it as a fact, together with the necessity of reconciling discrepancies in the accounts of Matthew and Luke, conspired to make it a most interesting point of speculation. These apocryphal writers have anticipated the difficulties which modern scholars have found, and their solutions are among the most plausible that have been offered. Strauss in his Life of Jesus exhibits the value and significance of the Apocrypha in this aspect. The immaculate birth of Jesus must be proved : it must be explained. Its private history must be published. This is what faith demanded, and we cannot but admire the ingenuity with which the demand was met. The virginity of Mary is to be established. She is accordingly brought up in the temple, where she spends the day mostly in prayer, and is visited by angels. She dedicates herself to God : solemnly before the priests takes the vow of chastity. But this vow causes a serious difficulty. It cannot be broken : but then marriage, too, is a sacred institution and a solemn moral duty, which cannot be dispensed with. The priests, in this dilemma, resolve to try the appeal by the budding staff. All the males are commanded to bring their rods, and he whose rod blossoms is to take the maiden. The lot falls to Joseph, an old man, too old to be Mary's husband ; so old, indeed, and decrepit, that he is ashamed to bring his staff, and tries to evade the decision for fear of ridicule. But he is divinely appointed by the sign, and Mary is given to him ; nominally as his betrothed, practically as his charge or ward : for she can remain no longer in the temple. That the chain of evidence may be complete, the story goes on to say that Joseph left home immediately, leaving Mary in the company of five young damsels, who never allowed her to be out of their presence. These damsels afterwards swear earnestly to Joseph, on his return, that his wife has been true to her vow. When Mary's condition can no longer be concealed, Joseph solemnly conjures her to tell him the truth : she, bitterly weeping, protests her innocence, calling God to witness ; and the afflicted man is assured and comforted by an angel. But the affair becomes public. Annas, the scribe, unluckily calls upon Joseph, to inquire why he had absented himself from the assembly, and discovers Mary's situation. He hastens to report the matter to the au-

thorities, for Joseph and Mary not being yet united in marriage, such a connection was regarded as a scandal and a sin. They by emissaries find that his report is true, and the guilty couple are summoned before the high-priest. This grave functionary charges them with the crime, and implores them to confess it. They both declare themselves innocent. The terrible ordeal must be passed through, in the presence of all the people, a crowd innumerable. Joseph calmly drinks the "water of conviction" and walks seven times round the altar, but no mark of sin appears on his countenance. Mary then drinks the water, performing the same ceremony, and she likewise comes out spotless: then, to make certainty doubly certain, she takes a solemn oath of her purity before the whole people. There is no gainsaying this. The high-priest and the nation are satisfied. But the chronicler is not satisfied yet. Mary's time draws nigh. One evening, on the road to Bethlehem, at a distance from any inn, she is obliged to seek the refuge of a cavern: there her child is born, amid the radiance of a celestial glory and the chanting of angelic songs. Joseph, who had gone out in search of a nurse, by and by returns with two, who are detained by a thick cloud without the cavern. These women Mary admits singly to her presence, and they both testify to her miraculous delivery. Here is a perfect chain of evidence. Every link is sound. It would be impossible to frame any thing more complete. "Virgo concepit, virgo peperit, virgo permanet." The sanctified formula of the Church, "Virgo ante partum, in partu, post partum," is justified by incontrovertible facts.

The circumstances attending the trial and the resurrection of Christ, so baldly told in the canonical Gospels, offered a still larger scope for invention. Such inquiries as these came up in regard to the trial: Who were Christ's judges? What charges were brought against him? Were there no witnesses on his side? Was no miraculous sign displayed in his behalf? In regard to the resurrection, questions like the following were put: What was the evidence that Jesus rose from the grave? What did he do between his burial and his resurrection? What is the secret history of his descent into Hades? Why did all these wonders produce no greater effect

upon the people ? In reply to similar inquiries, the Gospel of Nicodemus contains a long and minute account of all that occurred in connection with the trial, death, and resurrection of Jesus ; of which account we will give the briefest possible summary. Certain Jews, whose names are mentioned, accuse Jesus before Pilate, of calling himself a king, and the Son of God, of doing beneficent deeds on the holy Sabbath, and of casting out evil spirits by magical arts. Pilate thinks these rather extraordinary crimes, and says so ; but finally orders his messenger to seek Jesus and bring him in. The servant goes, meets Jesus riding into the city in triumphal procession, makes the humblest prostration before him, and delivers the governor's message. Jesus obeys the summons and follows the pursuivant, who out of respect spreads his mantle on the ground for the anointed feet to tread upon. In this way they reach the palace, amid the murmurs of the Jews. And now, as Jesus crosses the threshold of the hall, the banners of the guard bend forward and make obeisance. The accusers raise an outcry, and the standard-bearers are threatened with death if the thing occurs again ; but in spite of twelve sturdy men, six to a flag-staff, the banners again do reverence. Pilate is struck with fear, and the impression of awe is deepened by the dream of Procla, who for effect is represented as half a Jewess. But the Jews are unmoved : they tell Pilate that Jesus by magical power bent the flag-staffs and sent the dream. Jesus makes no reply. He is charged with being an illegitimate child ; with occasioning the murder of the infants of Bethlehem ; and with fleeing to Egypt with his parents, because they had no refuge among their own people. Twelve men who witnessed the betrothal of Mary and Joseph testify on oath that he is no illegitimate child. Pilate then asks the Jews their object in thus pursuing Christ to death. "Is it because of his good works that ye would kill him ?" "Yes." Here occurs some curious cross-questioning and sharp repartee between Pilate and the Jews, which we are obliged to omit. Now the closing charges are brought : blasphemy, which Pilate knows nothing about ; and high treason, which is established by a very ingenious process,—a process that reminds us very strongly of some modern attempts to prove a "conspiracy to overthrow

the government." The counsel for the prisoner at length steps forward,— Nicodemus. He urges the argument of Gamaliel, that God manages such matters; if Jesus is a true man, God will sustain him; otherwise he will fail. Let Providence decide the issue. After him comes up the long procession of those whom Christ had healed or raised from the dead; and they give in their testimony. But it is all in vain. The Roman governor has heard the charge of high treason, and is afraid. Pilate signs the death-warrant. Among the curiosities preserved to us, we must not forget to mention a copy of this death sentence, word for word. This interesting document was found miraculously, they say, at Aquileia, in the kingdom of Naples, inclosed in a marble chest which was placed within two others; one of iron and one of stone. It was written on parchment and in Italian, afterwards translated into French, and published in Paris, 1581. Another copy, containing a different form of the sentence, much shorter, written in Hebrew letters upon a brass plate, was discovered in the same town in the year 1820, on occasion of digging for Roman antiques. During the campaign in Southern Italy, this plate, inclosed within a box of ebony, was deposited in a sacristy of the Carthusians near Naples. The chest was afterwards removed to the Casertine Chapel; but the Carthusians kept the plate for the gifts and offerings it brought them.

Of course, the whole scene of Christ's trial and crucifixion, so hurriedly sketched by the Evangelists, required embellishment and addition in order to satisfy either the Christians or their opponents in a later age. Legends hang upon these facts like humming-bees, one clinging to another. We are told how many steps Jesus took from Pilate's palace to Calvary; what pauses he made; how often he fell; at which point he met Simon of Cyrene; how far it was thence to the spot where the weeping women stood; further on, a little way, Ahasuerus, the shoemaker, afterwards known as the "Wandering Jew," warns Jesus from his door-step, and is commanded "to go and wander restless over the world till the last day." At length Christ reaches the cross, and is nailed upon it. Each of these nails again has its history. As some say, two of them, when the Empress Helena found the cross in the year 326, were wrought

into the bridle of Constantine, one was thrown into the Adriatic Sea, to quiet its turbulent waters, and the fourth was appropriated for the head of Constantine's statue. According to other accounts, two were used for the bridle and two for the helmet of the Emperor. One of these nails is still preserved in the Milan Cathedral, and has a special anniversary on the 3d of May. Another, as Father Newman vouches, is wrought into the iron crown of Lombardy, still exhibited at Monza. The Romish Church has twenty-five nails from the true cross. The question would naturally come up of the possibility of Christ's being crucified at all. Could the cross consent to bear him? A Jewish tradition says on this point, that Jesus bewitched all the wood, making it too fragile for his weight; whereupon Judas ran to his private garden, and brought a huge cabbage-stalk, a wood proof against magical arts, and upon this Jesus was executed. Such miserable stories are not worth repeating; but it is well enough, perhaps, to know what idle tales were circulated about Christ, and were believed too.

The earthquake that rent the curtain of the temple, and the darkness that came over the whole land when Jesus gave up the ghost, have been stumbling-blocks in the way of some who granted the facts, but could not account for the bystanders' apathy before them. The Gospel of Nicodemus clears up this problem. Pilate, indeed, singularly enough, knew nothing of earthquake or darkness till the guard came in with their report; then he turned pale, shrank within himself, and for fear could not taste his food. He calls an assembly of the Jews. "What think you now? Was I not right?" "O, but it was only a common eclipse." "Say you so? But who ever saw an eclipse except at the new moon? And yesterday you ate the Passover on the fourteenth day of the month." Their mouths are shut. The history then goes on to tell how the friends of Jesus were persecuted, as we should expect they would have been, though our Gospels make no mention of it. The twelve who bore witness to Christ's legitimacy, Nicodemus, who made an argument in his defence, and Joseph of Arimathea, who requested the body for burial, were of course the objects of special hatred. The twelve had disappeared. Nicodemus was protected by his rank.

But Joseph could not escape. He was seized by the multitude, who were still more infuriated by his taunts and reproaches, dragged through the streets, doomed by the populace to death, and shut up for safe keeping during the night in a house that had no window, and whose only door was sealed and watched like the sepulchre. When he was sent for in the morning by the Sanhedrim, the seals were unbroken, the lock was undisturbed, but the prisoner was not to be found. While the members of the council are still deliberating in astonishment and dismay, some of the guard who had been set to watch the tomb of Jesus rush hastily in, bringing yet more appalling news. They had felt a great earthquake; they had seen an angel descend from heaven, roll away the stone, and sit upon it; they had heard him speak to the women, "Fear not; he is not here, he is risen." "But who were the women?" "We know not." "Why did you not arrest them?" "Because we were almost dead from fright." "We do not believe your story." "How should you, when you have disbelieved so many miracles? Give us Joseph, and we will give you Jesus." "Joseph has gone home." "And Jesus has gone into Galilee, as the angel said." Then the Jews, confounded but unsoftened, bribe the soldiers to report that Jesus had been stolen by the disciples,—a report which was in fact very widely current among the Jews in the middle of the second century, and a little earlier, perhaps; but Justin Martyr is the first to mention it.

So far the account is very like those in our canonical Gospels, only varied enough to make the evidence for the resurrection more complete. For the rest we are indebted to the scepticism or the credulity of an inquisitive age. The next point is to bring forward the testimony of Jews themselves. Accordingly, Phinehas, a priest, Addas, a scribe, and Aggaus, a Levite, just arrived from Galilee, come in, and assure the chiefs of the synagogues, the priests and the Levites, that they saw Jesus with his disciples sitting upon a mountain, and heard him say to them, "Go forth into all the world and preach," etc. After which direction he was taken upwards out of sight. This they affirm with an oath; but with equal readiness they take an oath not to tell any one else. So they are disposed of, silenced, and sent

out of town. But these things cause some commotion. In great agitation, the high-priests and rulers and elders assemble in the synagogue, and ask what all this means. Annas and Caiaphas give their views. "Why are you troubled? Must we believe the guards, that an angel came and rolled away the stone? They were bribed once, why not before? No doubt the disciples who stole the body paid them well to bring us that report." Nicodemus proposes a search for the body, with a view to determine whether Christ be dead or risen. The suggestion is adopted, the search is thoroughly executed; of course without success. The body is not discovered. But Joseph of Arimathea is found by one of the parties, alive and well. This fact being known, Joseph is cautiously and courteously invited to Jerusalem. He comes, is most affectionately received and bountifully feasted. The day after his arrival, he meets the whole assembled Sanhedrim, and tells his story, to this effect. He was shut up, in close confinement, as related. At midnight, after the Sabbath, as he stood and prayed, the house was lifted at the four angles,—a blaze of fire flashed into his eyes,—he fell to the earth,—a hand was laid upon him,—a voice addressed him,—he looked up and saw Jesus. To convince Joseph of his identity, Jesus led him to the sepulchre, and showed him the grave-clothes with the napkin; then bore him to his own house, laid him on the bed, kissed him, bade him remain in seclusion forty days, and departed. This explicit testimony of Joseph staggers the rulers and priests and Levites; they fall upon the earth,—they eat nothing for nine days. At length they revive, only, however, to be overwhelmed again by fresh news. Phinehas, Addas, and Aggaus are sent for by express, to repeat their tale. They come, and separately testify to the same effect: that they saw Jesus sitting with his disciples, heard what he said to them, and witnessed his ascension. Thus, "by the mouth of two or three witnesses, every word is established." Then spake Joseph: "And why wonder ye if Jesus be risen? That is not the marvellous thing, but this rather; that he summoned from their tombs many others, who have appeared to multitudes in Jerusalem. The graves of Simeon, of his sons and brothers, whom we lately buried, are open and empty, and they

walk living in Arimathea. Men hear them pray, but they address no one, and are dumb as the dead. Come, let us go and see them." Then uprose the rulers and high-priests and all the company, and came to Arimathea. They found the persons they sought, in prayer, accosted them, brought them to Jerusalem, and conjured them to tell their strange history. The men cross themselves, and call for paper, ink, and pen. They cannot speak, but they can write. And thus they relate what passed in Hades: "We were in the under-world with the rest of the dead. Suddenly, at midnight, a ray like the sun's broke through the gloom, and revealed us to one another. Then Abraham and the patriarchs and the prophets joyously united and conversed about the light. Isaiah said, 'This is the light of which I prophesied, saying, "The people that sat in darkness saw a great light.'" Then father Simeon joined them, and called to mind his prediction, that Christ should be 'a light to lighten the Gentiles.' All at once, as we were congratulating each other, John the Baptist, haggard and wild, lifted up his voice and began to preach repentance, for the coming of the Son of Man was nigh. So one after the other added his word of encouragement, and all were glad and elated. While the inhabitants of the dark realm were so full of rejoicing, the Lord of Darkness, Satan, rose, and thus addressed Hades: 'O thou greedy and insatiate, hear me. A Jew, named Jesus, has been crucified through our agency. Be ready, now, to bring him hither in safety. He has done a great deal of mischief in the world, persecuting my servants, healing my sick, raising my dead.' 'Can he do that?' said Hades. 'How, then, will you withstand him?' To whom rejoined Satan, 'Art thou afraid, O greedy and insatiate Hades, of this our common enemy? I have not feared him.' Hades replied, 'Lord of Darkness, Son of Ruin, Devil, but now thou saimest that his word summoned from the grave many whom thou didst slay. How shall we bind him, then?' While Satan and Hades were thus disputing, a mighty voice rolled like thunder through the shades, 'Open your doors, ye princes! Be ye opened, ye everlasting gates, for the King of Glory would come in!' Then said Hades to Satan, 'Go out and make what stand against him thou

canst; and, ye spirits, make strong the gates of brass, and draw the iron bolts, for woe to us if he gains admission.' The patriarchs then, with one accord, remonstrated with Hades. David exclaimed, 'O blind, knowest thou not that, while on the earth, I uttered that prophetic strain, "Open the doors, ye princes"?' And Isaiah, 'Impelled by the Holy Spirit, I wrote, "The dead shall rise, and those in the graves shall be raised, and they that are on the earth shall rejoice." And this too, "Death, where is thy sting? Grave, where is thy victory?"' And again the voice sounded mightily on: 'Open your doors!' 'Who is the King of Glory?' stammered Hades, with feigned ignorance. The reply came back in thunder tones from a thronging host of angels: 'The Lord, strong and mighty; the Lord, mighty in battle.' And at the word, the brazen doors crashed in; the iron bars were ground to powder; all the dead were loosed from their fetters. In marched the King of Majesty with human form, and the gloom of the underworld vanished before his dazzling glory. 'Who art thou,' screamed Hades, 'that hast such authority and might? that comest hither without sin, small in person, great in power, lowly and exalted, servant and master, hireling and king? Nailed to the cross, laid in the grave, already art thou free! Who art thou, that loosest the captive bound in the fetters of sin?' And the legions of devils cried, with fearful, shaking voices, 'Whence art thou, Jesus, a man so strong and majestic, so pure and spotless? Never did the upper world, which is ours and pays us tribute, send hither such a guest as thou.' Then the King of Majesty seized Satan, the Prince of Hell, by the crown, and delivered him over to his angels, to be bound in iron till the time of the second coming. And now, amid the din of blaspheming, hateful voices, the sweet tones of Jesus were heard, saying, 'Come unto me, all ye sanctified, who bear my likeness.' And all the saints gathered about him, and fell at his feet. Songs of benediction and praise filled the ghastly region with joy. Christ took Adam graciously by the right hand, and began the upward flight towards heaven. The rest in procession followed;—David singing his psalm,—Habakkuk shouting his cry of triumph,—Micah praising the Lord's forgiving mercy, which 'sunk our

sins in the bottom of the sea'; while ever and anon the mighty chorus pealed forth, 'Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord! Halleluia! Amen!' Thus the train of the ransomed were led on towards heaven. As we drew near the gates of paradise, behold, two old men waited there. One of them said, 'I am Enoch, the favorite of God, and this is Elias, the Tishbite. And we shall live till the end of the world; then will God send us to battle against Antichrist; we shall be slain, and in three days shall rise again, and be received into heaven.' While they were yet speaking, lo, a sad, downcast figure appeared, bearing a cross upon his shoulder. 'Who art thou, that hast the semblance of a robber, and what cross is that thou bearest?' 'I was a thief on the earth; I was crucified with Christ; I believed in him and said, "Lord, remember me, when thou comest into thy kingdom." And he replied, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise.'" Then arose a grander chorus of praise, and we all swept through the gates."

This is the story of those who rose with Christ, and who remained on earth, wandering up and down the Jordan, witnesses of the Lord's resurrection. They had been baptized, and clothed in white garments. Their companions had already ascended. They were about to ascend. They gave their scrolls into the hands of Annas, Caiaphas, and Gamaliel, and straightway vanished in light. This overwhelming testimony convinces the Jews. In a secret conclave, at which Pilate is present, the sacred books are brought and consulted, and by them it is proved that Jesus Christ is truly the Son of God. Pilate, become a Christian, writes a long letter to Cæsar, recounting all these events, and the history closes.

This extract is long, almost too long for an illustration. We have shortened the passage much, and taken other liberties with it. But we had not the heart to omit it altogether. For, apart from its striking dramatic form, it is curious in a doctrinal view, as exhibiting the prevalent opinions respecting Hades and paradise, the mission of Christ to the under-world, the office of Satan, and kindred matters. But it is as a piece of history that it interests us. All this was published and received as history. Its object was to accumulate evidence upon an historical point, to satisfy people by every possible argu-

ment that Christ had actually risen and ascended. The case is most ingeniously managed, for minds whose faith or whose ignorance is proof against many a practical incongruity and improbability. The descent of Christ into Hades was believed quite early by the Orthodox Church. The writer of the First Epistle of Peter believed it. The writer of Ephesians received it as a fact. But it was a fact based on a theory. It was a fact constructed wholly by the pious theological sentiment, without a scrap of historical reason. It was constructed by the same sentiment that enrolled Joseph, the father of Jesus, among the priesthood, that his son might be priest as well as king,—that gave the same Joseph the title of Confessor, Patriarch, Colleague of the Holy Spirit, assigned him a seat among the Apostles, made him a judge of the world, and designated him—as was actually done in a book published at Paris in 1627, and approved by the theological faculty—"the third person of the Holy Trinity reigning on earth." Where there is nothing like historical research or historical criticism, there can be no wrong in drawing upon the imagination for one's facts.

We have now fully illustrated one of the principles on which these old histories were constructed; namely, that gaps must be filled up, difficulties met, and questions answered. The second principle we can pass over more swiftly. History was invented to supply deficiencies and reconcile discrepancies. It was also invented to fulfil prophecies. This method of creating facts was one of the most common. We see it exemplified in our own canonical books, both Gospels and Epistles. Christ as Messiah was foretold by the ancient prophets, therefore a description of him must be found in their writings. Those old predictions were of course fulfilled, therefore the historical Christ is made to satisfy them. This is easily done, so long as attention is fixed upon the general features of the Messiah, or upon the general drift of the prophetic sayings. But when details come to be examined, text must be construed in accordance with history, and history must be builded in conformity with text. Things came to pass "in order that it might be fulfilled," or "so that it was fulfilled." Abundant instances of such historical treatment will occur to every careful reader of the four Gospels.

The apocryphal Gospels only carry out the same method. As men searched the Scriptures deeper, more passages of prophetical import were discovered, and consequently more correspondent facts were to be invented. Joseph's rod blossoms, and the dove descends upon it, because, according to Isaiah, "a rod shall spring from the root of Jesse, and a bud shall sprout from it, and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon it." Dragons worship Jesus, in conformity with the Psalm, "Praise the Lord, ye dragons." Lions in the desert lie down with oxen and asses; the wolf pastures with the sheep, as was foretold. The idols of Egypt fell in pieces before Christ, that the words of Isaiah might be fulfilled, "Behold, the Lord will come in a light cloud, and all the handiwork of the Egyptians shall be overthrown before his face." At the entrance of the cave where Christ was born, a fountain began to play. "O that one would give me to drink of the waters of Bethlehem, which are by the door!" An ox and an ass worshipped the infant Christ. "The ox knoweth his master, and the ass his master's crib." Christ must perform what the old prophets performed. He raises a boy from the dead, in imitation of Elijah and Elisha. Like Daniel, he is exposed in a den of lions, which not merely forbear to injure him, but most humbly do him reverence. Similar cases of accommodation might be mentioned almost without number; but they are monotonous and stupid, not worth speaking of at all except by way of examples. For this purpose we have cited enough.

Dr. Hofmann has collected many curious things relating to his subject. Pilate's death sentence is given at length; also his letter to Tiberius, mentioned above. We have also the correspondence said to have passed between Christ and Abgarus of Edessa,—a short letter on each side. The epistle from Christ, "written by his own hand," was perhaps forged in order to meet the assertion that Jesus left no writing. Attempts of this kind were frequent. The Church has in its possession several productions from the Saviour's pen. It knows very well what words Christ wrote upon the sand when the adulteress was brought before him. Fabricius mentions books enough to form a large collection,—no less than twelve separate documents. The most important of these are,—

1st. Books addressed to Peter and Paul upon magic, which Christ wrote shortly before his death. 2d. "Hymnus Christi quem dixit secrete Sanctis Apostolis discipulis, et qui in Canone non est positus, propter eos qui secundum se sentiunt, et non secundum Spiritum et Veritatem Dei"; the same hymn that Matthew speaks of as sung before going out from the chamber of the last supper. 3d. "Epistola Salvatoris Domini nostri Jesu Christi filii, quæ in Hierosolymis cecidit (de cœlo) Michael ipsam deportavit, et inventa est ad portam Ephrem per manus sacerdotis nomine Eros." This letter treats of the observance of Sunday in a manner that does not in the least remind one of the sentiments entertained by Jesus on that subject. 4th. A letter of our Lord Jesus Christ which fell from heaven, at Jerusalem, on the fourth of September. It was found in a great stone, which opened when the patriarch Johannilius took it in his hand. This letter contains threatenings against the unconverted. These are but a specimen of the writings which from time to time have been published as authentic, having fallen from heaven, or in some other equally marvellous way come into people's hands. Fabricius has a full account of them.

Dr. Hofmann has also taken from Fabricius and Grabe a number of sayings attributed to Christ by the ancient Church, but not reported in the canonical Gospels. It was never supposed that these Gospels contained all the Lord's words, and it would have seemed strange if others had not been preserved. Here, therefore, we have them. The demand is supplied. And a very poor supply it is. With one or two exceptions, nothing could be more insipid and unsuggestive than these sayings. Here is a noticeable one: "The same day he saw one laboring on the Sabbath, and said unto him, 'Man, if thou knowest what thou art doing, happy art thou; but if thou knowest not, thou art under the curse, a transgressor of the Law.'" One from the Gospel of the Hebrews: "Never be joyful except when ye have looked upon your brethren in love." These contain kernels of thought, unlike most of the rest.

Of course there are many descriptions of the person of Christ, sketched according to the ideal of manly beauty, or the peculiar cast of piety, or the favorite tradition,

that prevailed at the time. The following is the description which Lentulus, Pilate's predecessor, is said to have written in a letter to the Roman Senate:— “ He is a man of tall and goodly stature, of grave and impressive countenance; so that whoever looks upon him must love him, as well as fear. His locks, dark-colored and shining, fall in curls over his shoulders, and are parted in the middle of the head, after the manner of the Nazarenes. His brow is smooth and serene; his face, lightly tinged with red, is free from wrinkle or blemish; nose and mouth faultless; the beard strong and dark like the hair, not long, but divided; the eyes grayish-blue and clear. In rebuke he is terrible; in admonition mild and gracious, frank in his observation of worth. He has never been seen to laugh, but often to weep. His bearing is upright and firm. His hands and arms are beautiful to look upon. In speech he is frugal of words, and modest,— the fairest of all the sons of men.” We recognize in the foregoing sketch the type which the painters have all but universally copied, which has restricted the free conceptions of genius, and which has multiplied in many a masterpiece that regular, sad, drooping countenance, regular, but lifeless and passive, which fails utterly to present to us the divine tenderness and the human faith of Jesus. The common print, said to have been taken by order of the Emperor Tiberius, giving us a very interesting profile, strongly expressive of human energy and mortal suffering, is of great antiquity. Of the portraits of Christ taken off upon napkins and handkerchiefs, nothing need be said, though the wisest have believed them authentic.

As works of art these apocryphal Gospels do not certainly stand high. For the most part their style is extremely simple and homely. Occasionally, however, we meet with a passage of uncommon beauty. Here is one. Anna the mother of Mary bewails her barrenness. “ As she looked up to heaven she saw the nest of a sparrow upon the laurel-tree, and sighed: ‘ Woe is me! woe is me! who has begotten me, and what body has borne me, that I am become a curse before the children of Israel, despised, reviled, thrust from the temple of the Lord my God? Woe is me! to what shall I compare myself? Not to the birds of heaven, for they are fruitful before

thee, O God ; not to the dumb beasts, for they are fruitful before thee ; not to the waters, for they, O Lord, are fruitful ; not to the earth, for the earth brings forth fruit in its season, and blesseth thee.' " The description of Mary growing up in the temple is very sweet. But the beauty throughout is artless. Even the scene of Christ's descent into Hades is told with the utmost simplicity, though the very idea compels the insertion of one or two sounding passages.

Much might be said of the doctrinal character of these books, did our space permit. But we must pass this matter altogether by. Let it suffice to say, that the dogmatical opinions are such as belong to the second and third centuries, and are almost the only data from which we can infer the antiquity of the books.

A far more interesting point is the moral character of these apocryphal writings. A distinctive moral character they can scarcely be said to possess. There is very little of Christ in them. Their subject is not Jesus, but the circumstances of Jesus. Of his soul, their perception is the very faintest. He is a theme, a theological postulate, not a man or moral being at all. He is rarely introduced speaking ; and in general it is but a negative impression that he leaves upon us. Some things that he does are very decidedly bad. He is crafty, cruel, disobedient, and vain. The virtues of humanity are wanting in him, such qualities having given place to mere theological virtues in those who thus wrote his history. The little goodness he displays is Messianic, or according to prophecy, and is due to the Old Testament. No worthier excellence, perhaps, could these biographers discover or appreciate ; for of living goodness distinctively Christian in that age there was none. Virginity is held in extravagant esteem, as it was generally by the early Christians. According to Jerome, Elisha was a virgin, and Jeremiah, with many others. John of Damascus writes that the body of Daniel was so hardened by chastity, that the lions could not fasten their teeth upon it ; and three boys brought their flesh to such a state by temperance, that fire would not burn them. So Mary urges the example of Abel, of Elias, and, strangely enough, of David, to countenance her own virginity. None but ecclesiastical and theological virtues are held in any considerable re-

pute by these writers. Of Jesus of Nazareth, the just and the tender, the heroic and the merciful, exalted above the highest and lowlier than the humblest, no trace is left.

This is to us a significant fact, going far to confirm the substantial genuineness of Christ's character as portrayed by the Evangelists. On these dull minds and flaccid souls the living human Jesus has made no impression of himself. The beautiful image is all blurred and disjointed. So little capacity had these pious Christians and Christian Fathers, even for reflecting his goodness; and this, too, when the name of Jesus had been professed a hundred years and more, and men ought to have understood, in some degree at least, the excellence which he exemplified. Nevertheless, through all these murky shades of ignorance and formalism, that delicate light has penetrated to us. Through all this variety of distorting media, cloudy and dense, Jesus is seen in outline singularly clear. Truly, then, he must have been great indeed, transcendently great, to enable any eyes so distant as ours to behold him ever so imperfectly. Shall we say that his character was an invention in those dark ages? The very idea is self-destructive. It was no invention of Jew or Gentile, or both. It was no compilation from the Old Testament or the Talmud. It was no fabrication, unless men can describe what they cannot imagine. Christ must have burst through the limits of Hebrew thought and feeling. He stood by himself, a moral and religious wonder, which men who lived near him beheld and revered. His biographers gave him to us in spite of themselves. They could not bury him beneath their own weight of dulness. This is significant to us of some great original power in Jesus Christ. He was not the development of his age, but the fresh manifestation of God.

Comparisons have often been instituted between the apocryphal and the canonical Gospels. Sometimes impudently, by those who would disparage the latter, or timidly, by those who would defend them. Much that has been said by Christian apologists is undoubtedly just; but we rarely see the great difference between these works fully and fairly stated. The main stress is usually laid upon the miraculous character of the respective

productions. This is well, but it is not all. It is true, the miracles of the apocryphal Gospels are often trivial, unmeaning, immoral, savoring much of the vulgarly fabulous. But this may in part be accounted for by the circumstance, that the books were written as uncanonical, and that the occasion for miracle necessarily became more frivolous as miracles were multiplied, while the taste of the gross and credulous people grew coarser with what it fed on. Besides, as the writings were circumstantial, rather than doctrinal, the spirit of invention was naturally more reckless. But this criterion of miracles is at the best formal and superficial; while the difference between the canonical and the apocryphal Gospels is radical and essential. It stamps itself upon their substance and their construction, upon their idea and their form.

The Gospels we have were composed in the heated age of controversy, ere yet any standard of Scriptural authority was established. The broad truth was open. Fundamental questions were debated by the greatest minds. Opinions were slowly forming. Every book that was written represented a party,—a form of belief. Consequently, our Gospels bear a distinctive theological character. Doctrine is first in importance,—biography of secondary rank. The books are doctrinal books. So regarded in their day, so accepted and sanctioned by the Church of a later day.

But these apocryphal Gospels were written after the canon was closed. The one faith was fixed, at least so far as the books containing it were concerned. Evangelical compositions had no longer the solemn, dignified purpose they previously had. Nothing was left but to dwell upon local and incidental points of belief, and to clear up doubtful and tangled matters of history. Hence the books we have been considering are in greater measure historical. They possess a kind of antiquarian value, but are of little worth to Christians generally. It naturally ensued, that, having no hold upon the religious sentiments of any influential party, they fell into disuse and perished.

Then, too, the moral and spiritual superiority of the New Testament writings is very remarkable. The mystic discourses of John, those rapt utterances, delighting

the speculative by their philosophical expression and moving the devout by their impressive piety; the practical maxims and searching principles of Matthew; the Sermon on the Mount; the noble, beautiful parables, scattered up and down the first three Evangelists; and running through all, the marvellous character of Jesus, not fully drawn, nor in all parts complete, but still matchless in moral elevation and spiritual loveliness, with its wonderfully blended virtues, its elements of faith and self-sacrifice, of courage and meekness, of patience and energy, glorious fragments which, by their very incompleteness, suggest to our imaginations a being such as the world has never seen; — all such traits commend themselves.

The apocryphal Gospels have none of these qualities, not a single one. They have no discourses that address the reason, the conscience, or the soul. They have no precepts above their age; they have no morality and no piety; they substitute the dulness of pedantry for the living truth of the heart; and their Christ is a poor wooden creature, contrived by the wit of not overingenious superstition, and decked out with the tinsel ornaments of a feeble and false imagination.

In addition to all this, our Gospels are works of art. They are elaborate compositions; by no means the rude and artless records they are commonly supposed to be. They possess unity of design and harmony of execution. The fourth Gospel, as a literary work, is highly wrought throughout. It is an admirable composition for its day. The art is not so apparent in the first three Evangelists, nor is it so perfect in them; but we recognize it on a closer inspection. Now, are the poor, incoherent fragments of apocryphal Gospels, which tell a few improbable stories about the infancy or the death of Christ, to be compared with such productions as these? Why, had there never been the least thought of assigning an Apostolic origin to the New Testament writings, and had these historical scraps borne the very mark and autograph name of disciples, the judgment of Christendom would have been the same that it was. The canon of Scripture would have stood, in every important point, as it stands to day. The same books would have lived, the same would have perished. For the mind that loves

truth has a sense of truth, and is not to be duped by any false imitations of it.

One Dr. Richard Clemens is at present publishing in Stuttgart a new edition of these fragments, which he entitles "The Suppressed or so-called Apocryphal Gospels." Suppressed indeed! How could they be otherwise than suppressed, borne under by their own weight? They were made of refuse material, they interested a small circle, and of course could not serve the permanent uses of the Church. But they have their value still. They open to us the mind and heart and religious spirit of the ancient times, as no other writings can. They disclose the workings of Christian thought upon matters of critical inquiry. And they furnish pregnant suggestions respecting the composition of those greater books, which tell us all we know of Christ, and relate the early movements of that faith which, in after time, assimilated to itself the thought and reverence of the civilized world.

O. B. F.

---

### ART. III.—THE RELIGION OF GEOLOGY.\*

THIS is a book. We mean by this, that it contains the discussion of an important subject, by one who is both able and in earnest. President Hitchcock is no tamperer with subjects which he does not understand, upon which he has not thought long and seriously. We are not surprised that his mind has been deeply interested in the discussions which have taken place respecting the relations of revealed and geological truth. Indeed, the subject of natural religion seems to claim peculiar attention at this time, especially on account of the modifications of their interpretations of Scripture which recent scientific truths require at the hands of theologians. It is of no use for interpreters to attempt to blink these subjects. They cannot do it if they would; it would

\* *The Religion of Geology, and its connected Sciences.* By EDWARD HITCHCOCK, D. D., LL. D., President of Amherst College, and Professor of Natural Theology and Geology. Boston: Phillips, Sampson, and Company. 1851. pp. xvi, 511.

be wicked for them to do it if they could. Every body reads now-a-days; and every body knows that supposed difficulties exist, that insuperable obstacles lie in the way of present explanations. Some new interpretations must be given, or the validity of Revelation will be shaken. One class of interpreters either deny the facts of Geology, or give such an account of them as makes confusion worse confounded. Granville Penn, in his "Comparative Estimate of the Mineral and Mosaic Geologies," Fairholme, in his "Geology of Scripture," Dr. Young, in his "Scriptural Geology," Rev. Henry Cole, in his "Popular Geology subversive of Divine Revelation," Rev. R. Wilson, in his "Strictures on Geology and Astronomy," are specimens of this class. We will name no examples in our own country. On the other hand, Dr. John Pye Smith, "On the Relations between the Holy Scriptures and some Parts of Geological Science," which was reviewed in this journal,\* Dr. Harris, in his "Pre-Adamite Earth" and in "Man Primeval," Rev. John Anderson, D. D., in his "Course of Creation," and Rev. David King, LL. D., are examples of those who accept the facts of Geology, and by various modifications of the popular interpretations of the Bible endeavor to reconcile them with Revelation.

Still another class of writers, accepting the facts of Geology, deny the facts of Revelation, as utterly irreconcilable with them on any credible hypothesis.

That some modification must be made in the popular interpretation of the first chapter of Genesis is evident to every scholar who is a believer in both Geology and the Bible. And no man sees this more clearly than President Hitchcock. He feels keenly, too, the peril of any attempt at modification in the popular interpretation of the Scriptures. The cry of "heresy" is not yet powerless, and he who ventures to question orthodox opinions ventures to be called a denier of the faith of the Bible; and to crown the whole, as more terrible, because least understood, a "Transcendentalist"! Hence the tone of the President's work is deprecatory. He is not timid, however. He has thought for himself, and these thoughts he frankly expresses. He claims that Geology requires

\* January, 1841.

no greater modification of popular opinion than astronomy did, and that he who accepts the truths of astronomy and still accepts the Scriptures, can accept them in connection with the facts of Geology. The opposition to astronomical science, and its supposed contradiction of Scripture, are well illustrated by an extract which is made from Turretin : —

" He propounds the inquiry, ' Do the sun and moon move in the heavens and revolve around the earth, while the earth remains at rest ? ' This he affirms, ' in opposition to certain philosophers,' and sustains his position by the following arguments : ' First. The sun is said [in Scripture] to move in the heavens, and to rise and set. Ps. xix. 5 : The sun is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run a race. Ps. civ. 19 : The sun knoweth his going down. Eccles. i. 5 : The sun also ariseth, and the sun goeth down. Secondly. The sun, by miracle, stood still in the time of Joshua (Joshua x. 12 – 14), and by a miracle it went back in the time of Hezekiah (Isa. xxxviii. 8). Thirdly. The earth is said to be fixed immovably. Ps. xciii. 1 : The world also is established, that it cannot be moved. Ps. civ. 5 : Who laid the foundations of the earth, that it should not be removed for ever ? Ps. cxix. 90, 91 : Thou hast established the earth, and it abideth. They continue this day according to thine ordinances. Fourthly. Neither could birds which fly off through an hour's circuit be able to return to their nests ; for in the mean time the earth would move four hundred and fifty of our miles. Fifthly. Whatever flies or is suspended in the air ought [by this theory] to move from west to east ; but this is proved not to be true from birds, arrows shot forth, atoms made manifest in the sun, and down floating in the atmosphere.' *Compendium Theologicae Didactico-Electicae* (Amsterdam, 1695)."

To a merely lexical and grammatical interpreter, such reasoning would be conclusive, and he would not deign to examine either the alleged facts, or the arguments of the astronomer. So the inquisitors and cardinals would not look through Galileo's telescope to see whether what he asserted was true or not. At the present day, also, some theologians plant themselves upon some passage, phrase, or word of Scripture, and sooner could a mountain be removed out of its place, than they removed one hair's breadth from their position. They can see nothing, though the meridian sun blazes before their eyes ; they can hear nothing, though the thunder rolls across the sky.

Such men are hopeless cases. They worship the letter and not the spirit of the Bible, and hence they are killed, not made alive. President Hitchcock is a full believer in the inspiration of the Scriptures after the straitest model. His religious views are of such a school, that Geology clashes with them much more directly than with ours. Still, the facts of Geology are so well established, that he thinks it little short of madness to deny them, or attempt to ignore them. The only practical question with him is, "How can the facts of Geology and my system of religion be harmonized?" To this work he applies himself; and he does it bravely. He shrinks from no difficulty, however appalling; he turns aside from no obstinate fact, though it be hard as quartz. He drills his way through the mountain of difficulties before him, using his pick and hammer as freely as when among the rocks and in the ravines. His originality gives freshness to his book. It has the fragrance of the woods and fields. It reminds us of "The Old Red Sand-stone," in this respect. Not that President Hitchcock has the rhetorical skill of Hugh Miller. Far otherwise. His style is almost as angular, but not as polished, as his crystals. Still, he draws his arguments and illustrations fresh from his own investigations. He is no book-worm, in the sense of eating up other men's thoughts and spinning them out again. He has read books enough, and knows what they say; but he has eyes of his own, and he has used them. We have been very much interested, therefore, in seeing how such a man, with such a religious creed, would manage the subject which he has taken in hand, and which was made so much more difficult to him than it would be to others, whose views differ from his own. We are not sure, however, that he has hit upon the right method of solution. We will state some of the difficulties, his method of disposing of them, and the objections to it.

The first difficulty is found in fixing the epoch of creation; popular interpretation placing the creation of the heavens and the earth about six thousand years ago, six days before man was made, and Geology as many millions of years ago.

Geologists who respect the account of the creation as recorded in Genesis adopt one or the other of two

methods in attempting to remove this difficulty. One method is to understand the six days as indefinitely long periods of time, each including millions of ages. The insuperable objection to this hypothesis, which every sound interpreter sees, is, that an "evening and morning" are said to constitute the day, and it is incredible that the earth in the beginning required millions of years to perform one revolution on its axis, a necessary consequence of the hypothesis. We are not aware that, at this day, any intelligent geologist and interpreter of Scripture endeavors to maintain this view.

The other method to which we referred is derived from the hypothesis, that millions of years elapsed between the "beginning," when the heavens and the earth were created, and the time when "God said, Let there be light: and there was light." During all these inconceivably long ages, "the earth was *without form and void*, and *darkness* was upon the face of the deep, and the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters." While this chaotic mass was fermenting under the wings of the Spirit, the "deep" was made to "boil like a pot" by the monsters that swept through its waters, and the darkness was made hideous with the noise of "doleful creatures." Race after race came and went; plesiosaurians, megalosaurians, oceans of fish, and forests of birds, all lived, enjoyed, and died, during these "dark" ages. Beds of rock miles in thickness were deposited from the sediment contained in the turbid water; bowlders were transported across valleys and driven up to the tops of high mountains by ocean currents and icebergs; destructions and creations followed each other in long succession, anterior to the word which God spake, as recorded in the third verse of the first chapter of Genesis,— "Let there be light: and there was light." Such is the other method; and the six days are understood to be periods of twenty-four hours each, in which the work was done which is recorded in the rest of the chapter.

To us there is an insuperable objection to this hypothesis. It is not, that the language does not admit the construction thus put upon it, as a possible one. We do not think it the obvious nor the probable one, however. There is nothing in the language which naturally admits of such a construction, and the mere fact that

a few commentators have suggested it as possible, and a few advocated it as probable, only shows how many *possible* meanings a passage *may* have, and not what its real meaning is. But this is not our objection to the hypothesis. It has weight, but we pass it by as being a common one, and one frequently discussed. Our objection is a more serious one, and, as we believe, fatal to the hypothesis. It did not escape the keen eye of President Hitchcock, and he has endeavoured to obviate it. But ineffectually, we think, and we will endeavor to show that our opinion is not without reason. The objection is this. The fossils of this long period, which are now exhumed from their ancient tombs in the rock, have organs of vision. Were these animals and fishes furnished with eyes millions of ages before light was created? The fishes in the Mammoth Cave have no eyes. Why should the animals which roamed in the forests and swam in the seas of the ante-Adamite world have been furnished with these useless organs? President Hitchcock admits that the "objection is probably insuperable, . . . if it be indeed true that light was not called into existence till the first day." It is *certainly* insuperable so far as present scientific and philological knowledge extends. Is not the record clear and emphatic, that "light" was made on the first day? President Hitchcock suggests, and quotes Rosenmüller in confirmation of his suggestion, that the "lights," spoken of in the fourth day, were not then "made," but their office pointed out, namely, to "divide the day from the night"; and to be "for signs and for seasons, and for days, and years." It is very difficult to reconcile this view with the rest of the fourth day's work, for it is explicitly said, "And God *made* two great lights, . . . and God *set* them in the firmament of the heaven, to *give light* upon the earth." They were both "made" and "set to give light" on the *fourth* day; not simply brought to view, "set"; but they were "made" also. Even if it is granted that the "lights," sun and moon and stars also, were now for the first time brought out of the chaotic mist in which they had been previously enveloped, it is evident that, according to the record, "light" was not made before the first day. The sun, moon, and stars must have been *made*, created, when God said, "Let

there be light." If they were not then created, should one choose such an interpretation, and President Hitchcock seems to do it, then the only remaining hypothesis is, to suppose that the darkness over the earth had been so thick and impenetrable that no ray had ever reached the "formless" earth. He says, "We may suppose that the production of light was only rendering it visible to the earth, over which darkness hitherto brooded; not because no light was in existence, but because it did not *shine* upon the earth." Then we ask again, why did the inhabitants of the waters, now found in shoals, almost, in the old red sandstone, have eyes, when not a beam of light had ever pierced the "darkness that was upon the face of the waters"?

The record distinctly declares that the period of time, be it longer or shorter, which elapsed from the creation of "the heavens and the earth" to the time when "God said, Let light be, and light was," was one deep and unbroken darkness. So even President Hitchcock appears to admit in the passage quoted. But this admission is fatal to the original hypothesis, of a long series of ages before the first day's work, in which the sun shone brightly, and the moon rose joyfully, and the stars glowed purely in the sky, which spread its canopy over millions of animated beings that sported in joy beneath its overarching beauty.

The supposition that the wants of Geology are met by occupying the interval before the first day in making the changes in the earth's crust, and destroying and creating successive races of inhabitants, is not permissible, because it is expressly asserted in the record that light was made on the first day, or if not *made*, it is most emphatically declared that it did not shine upon the earth before that day. But this is not all. We have another objection, which is to us equally fatal to President Hitchcock's interpretation. It is this. The earth is declared, in the second verse of the first chapter of Genesis, to be "without form and void," empty, waste. The words are used to express utter barrenness and desolation. Did the earth then teem with delighted existence? Did the seas swarm with fish, and the land abound with animals, and the air echo with the songs of birds? This geological hypothesis and the words of

the record will not harmonize. We are aware that some critics have gone so far as to say that the Hebrew conjunction at the beginning of the second verse may be rendered "and afterwards" the earth was without form and void. So it is inferred that a long period transpired before the earth became chaotic, in which it had form and was not void, and then another long period after it became chaotic, in which desolation and darkness brooded over the wreck of our world. This criticism is too feeble to stand before examination. It is too clearly forced to require remark. One geological fact, however, may be stated, which shows that by admitting the criticism we only sink into a "lower deep" of difficulty. It is this. Some species of plants and animals now live upon the earth which lived before this supposed wreck of the world. How did they continue to exist and multiply during that interminable period of chaos and deathlike darkness? We think the abyss of difficulty is deepened by such critical conjectures. The Bible clearly describes the condition of the earth, between the creation and the fiat for light, as being chaotic, desolate, dark, uninhabited and uninhabitable. There is no foothold for the geologist, there is no theatre for all his animated existences and vegetable products.

That the facts of Geology are indisputable is acknowledged on all hands. That the earth existed, and was covered with vegetation and inhabited by animals, millions of years before man was created, seems certain, and is also acknowledged. It is likewise equally evident, that the popular interpretation of Genesis is directly opposed to these facts and to this long period of the earth's existence. What, then, is to be done? The popular interpretation must be abandoned, as it was in the case of the astronomical difficulties before stated. But what can be adopted in its place, *salve fide*, and still maintain the inspiration of the first part of Genesis? This is the practical question with those who believe that these chapters are inspired. Those who reject their inspiration have no difficulties in their way. They have only to say, "The old writer was mistaken." We do not deal now with this class of theologians and geologists. We address those who believe in the inspiration, the plenary inspiration, of these first chapters of Genesis,

and we ask, How can they reconcile the doctrine of inspiration with the facts of Geology? Not in the ways above proposed, we are satisfied. Both methods of removing the difficulty are surrounded with insuperable objections, and attended with apparent — may we not say real? — contradictions, as great, as real, as the original ones which they were designed to obviate. We cannot extend the six days into ages, each including a million of years; nor can we intercalate a gloriously carpeted earth and brilliantly garnished heavens, retaining their youthful beauty for millions of ages, between the first and third verses of Genesis. What, then, is to be done? We answer, no one supposes the account in Genesis to be a scientific account of the creation of things. Popular language is used to describe scientific truth, or rather popular language is used, whether the writer understood the scientific truth or not. A solid firmament, with windows, overspreads the earth, in which the sun, moon, and stars are set, and above which is an upper ocean. This was the popular opinion, and, according to the common interpretation, the writers were inspired to use this language in speaking of the creation of the heavens and earth. No person then living understood the scientific truth. The account contained a falsehood if it intended to teach men the true order and process of creation, and the nature of the heavens and earth. Hence most intelligent geologists who receive this portion of Genesis as inspired deny that it was any part of the writer's design to teach cosmogony to the people. His design was to announce that *their* God was the creator of all things, to that he was *one*, and that *polytheism* was a delusion, a lie. At all events, no one supposes that it was the purpose of the writer to give to the Jews a true, scientific account of the creation of the world. What, then, shall be said of this account? In reply, we would inquire whether Moses might not have been inspired, directed by God, to collect these accounts, (for the first chapters of Genesis are confessedly a compilation, and not the composition of the compiler,) for some purpose *entirely distinct from their scientific or historical value*. Moses had given to the people the law of God, and had announced that He alone was God, the Creator, Preserver, Lord of all things. As a confirmation of the

truth of his revelation and law, and as an inducement to accept it, he might be directed to collect the oldest accounts of the origin of things which were extant, to show that the fundamental principles of his legislation had the sanction of the earliest ages, and that the nearer they ascended to the beginning of things, the more nearly did the fundamental truths of theology correspond to those which they had received from his hand. He does not make himself responsible for the truth of the opinions or of the cosmological statements contained in the documents. He only says, by Divine direction, These old accounts show that later generations have gone astray from the primitive faith, and cannot claim for their religion and gods the antiquity which belongs to yours. The mouths of cavillers would thus be shut, and the respect due antiquity would be added to the Divine command to induce the people to regard the Law. Moses would be just as much inspired in this case as in the other. He would collect and arrange his documents under the special guidance of the Spirit. He would insert nothing which the Spirit forbade him to insert, and thus the account would be inspired in the sense that it was arranged and published by Divine direction and under the special guidance of the Spirit. God saw that it would be well for these old accounts to be preserved and spread abroad, and he directed them to be collected, not because of their historic, scientific verity, but for dogmatic purposes, to give to future ages the opinions of the earliest time. As far as giving these opinions is concerned, they are correct. Moses has correctly given them, but he has not vouched for their truth. Thus the inspiration of the writer is retained, while the scientific statements are considered only as opinions of the ancients. The reasons which induced the inspired collection of their early opinions may not be fully known to us. But we are confident that reasons can be found far more satisfactory to the religious and scientific mind, than the attempts which have yet been made to reconcile geological facts with the usual understanding of the statements of these chapters. Should our remarks fall under the eye of President Hitchcock, we would ask his attention to this hypothesis. For reasons which are satisfactory to the Divine mind, but which we may not be able fully to

understand, he directed Moses to make this collection of ancient opinions, and prefix it to the account of the Abrahamic race, not because it contained unmixed truth, but because the preservation of those opinions would be valuable to Israel and mankind. Let the President take this hypothesis, and follow it out with the candor and acumen with which he has labored on the other, and we are sure he will meet with better success. This labor will require no endeavor to reconcile modern science with the ancient record, to preserve its inspiration; but will only demand that reasons should be found in the contents of the collection and the condition of the Jews why God should have directed the *preservation* of such opinions.

But we must leave this topic, as we wish to make a few remarks on some other points discussed in the volume before us.

The common doctrine is, that physical death, the death both of man and other animated beings, was caused by sin. We are not aware that any theologians have gone so far as to maintain that the vegetable creation is subject to the law of decay for the same cause. We are sure, however, that they were not prevented from so doing by any absurdity in the opinion, or any difficulty, in their view, of maintaining it. It seems rather to have been an oversight than a choice. Geology apparently flatly contradicts this opinion respecting the cause of death, and it is necessary, therefore, to make an attempt to reconcile the popular interpretation and scientific truth. Millions of animals died millions of ages before Adam was created. There is no way of escaping this fact. It stands before this class of theologians as Apollyon stood before Christian. Some, of more daring than judgment, have maintained that God made these fossils in the rocks, that they never were parts of living animals, and hence that no death took place before Adam fell. But this class of interpreters is fast disappearing, and we should not be surprised if, in after time, anti-quarians should theorize upon their opinions as they now do upon the fossils, and maintain that opinions so destitute of common sense were never sincerely believed, but, like Gulliver's Travels, were published to feed the credulity and amaze the stupidity of past generations. Pres-

ident Hitchcock does not belong to this class. Not he. The hypothesis which he seems to maintain has some symmetry and philosophy in it, and we do not remember to have met with it before. It is this. God foresaw that Adam would sin, and hence that death would enter into the world; it was therefore necessary, for the uniformity of his works and the final accomplishment of his purposes, that death should be universal, and therefore he commenced on the system which would have been introduced by the sin of Adam, so that uniformity is maintained from the first. Such is his theory, stated briefly in our own words. We object to this whole hypothesis the single consideration, that the Bible never attributes the death of the body to *sin as its cause*. But few will now deny that human beings would have been removed from the earth in some way if Adam had not sinned; and also that animals would have ceased to exist. It must have been so, for some animals were made to feed upon others. We admit that Adam is told that he shall die if he eats of the forbidden tree; but we know equally well that nothing is said about his *body's* dying, and that it is emphatically said that he was to die "*in the day*" in which he should eat thereof, which most surely he did not do, in the sense usually accepted; he did not cease to live as an animated creature. The *cause* of death to Adam is given in the nineteenth verse of the third chapter of Genesis: "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return unto the ground; FOR out of it thou wast taken: FOR *dust thou art*, and unto dust shalt [better rendered *will*] thou return." The record does not say he would return to dust because he had sinned, but because he *was* dust, and was made of dust, perishable materials. The passage in Romans v. 12,— "As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned,"— does not refer to the death of the body, as the connection most fully shows, but to spiritual death, from which Christ had come to save us.

If, then, Adam's physical death is not declared to be caused by sin, much less should we expect to find the cause of the death of animals in that act of the first man. There is certainly not a passage in the Bible which can be made, by any instruments of critical torture, to testify

to the doctrine that animals die or suffer on account of the sin of Adam, *since* he fell ; much less can any thing be brought to show that for this cause they died and suffered millions of years *before* his fall. The true mode of reconciling Geology and the Bible on this point, is to let the Bible speak for itself, and not superinduce upon its words a meaning which they do not contain. God made man and animals mortal. Scripture and science both testify to this view. Sin may give death its sting,—may make it more painful and dreadful,—but it is not the cause of the dissolution of our bodies. It is time that this opinion was driven from the world, and science is joining with a sound interpretation of Scripture in hastening its exit. The popular opinion, that all physical suffering is the consequence of sin,—of Adam's sin in particular,—is doomed to pass away. The indisputable facts of Geology cannot be reconciled with it in any reasonable manner. The ground which we take is, that the Scriptures never attribute the bodily death of men to sin as its cause, much less do they attribute the death of animals to sin ; and whatever difficulties may attend the interpretation of two or three passages of the Bible on our hypothesis, we submit that they are both fewer and less objectionable than those which so thickly beset the attempts to reconcile the popular opinion and the facts of Geology. The latter hypotheses are in some cases simply ridiculous. We remember being present, not long since, at the delivery of a "trial sermon" before a synod, in which the preacher—a geologist of some note, too—was endeavoring to harmonize his geological and Presbyterian creeds. That animals died long before the Fall was perfectly clear ; that they fed upon each other was equally clear ; and that suffering, pain, would exist, seemed also to be certain, but this he could not admit. He had not the genius to invent President Hitchcock's hypothesis, that a system of suffering was antedated to give unity to creation, and hence he was obliged to resort to such expedients as his inferior capacities enabled him to adopt. The system which commended itself most fully to his mind was this. God had given to all creatures such a high sense of the rectitude of his government and the perfect justice of all his ways, that pain ceased to be pain, suffering was deprived of its power by an all-per-

vading submission of the will to the Divine law ; so that when the lion seized the hare and craunched his bones in his bloody jaws, the timid creature had such a deep sense of its obligation to be reconciled to the Divine will, and such a clear knowledge of the object of its creation, that the cracking of its bones, the tearing of its vitals, became an actual enjoyment for which it had a keen relish, a thrilling delight,—

“So that the *pleasure was as great,*  
*Of being eaten as to eat ! !*”

Of course this was satisfactory ; for a man who could accept that would have no difficulty in receiving and inwardly digesting the Confession of Faith. He received the blessing of his brethren, and is now enlightening the world !

But to return to our author. He does not present his hypothesis as entirely satisfactory, but as one which to his mind appears attended with fewer difficulties than any other. He goes so far, indeed, in one instance, as to say, that “the death threatened to Adam may have been only the terrible aggravations of a departure out of this world, which have followed in the train of transgression.” Very near the truth, if not exactly it, we think.

The other topics discussed in the volume are the “Deluge,” which is supposed to have been confined in its action to Western Asia, where man resided ; “The Eternity of Matter,” which the facts of Geology seem to deny ; “The Benevolence of the Deity,” everywhere manifest in the past as well as present structure of the earth, and its adaptation to races of animals in its various conditions to the present time ; “The Development Hypothesis,” which is shown to be refuted by the testimony of the rocks and fossils ; “The Unity of Design,” seen through all periods of the earth’s existence, and the various classes of animated existences which have inhabited it ; “Special Providence,” as revealed in the new creations which have from time to time taken place upon the globe ; “The Vast Plans of the Deity,” as seen in the illimitable ages in which he was occupied in perfecting the structure of the earth, and making it the abode of man ; “The New Heavens and the New

Earth," as prophesied of in the elements which now exist capable of producing an entire change in the earth's structure, so as to render it the abode of the spirits of men after the general resurrection; "The Influence of Human Actions upon the Universe," in which we find Babbage's idea, that a physical record of all human acts is kept and will be read in the spiritual world; and, finally, "that the bearings of all science, when rightly understood, are eminently favorable to religion, both in this world and the next." We should like to give a synopsis of the views presented under these heads; but we have already exceeded our intended limits. Especially should we like to state our author's views upon the "resurrection-body." We cannot deny ourselves the opportunity of making one quotation and one observation. He says:—

"It is not necessary that the resurrection-body should contain a single particle of the matter laid in the grave, in order to be the same body."

Our observation is, that then no bodies are to rise from the grave, but such bodies will be given by God as the spirit requires and as the future state needs. Much of the windy rhetoric, as contrary to good taste as to Scripture truth, which has been expended on this doctrine, will cease when President Hitchcock's view is adopted.

We intended to call the attention of our readers, and of President Hitchcock, should he chance to read our notice of his book, to his tendency to confound the evidences of Christianity with the evidences of the authenticity and inspiration of the account of the creation in the first two chapters of Genesis, and to so speak of the latter as to carry the idea that the everlasting Gospel of the Son of God rests upon the truth of the ante-Abrahamic genealogy and chronology and conchology. President Hitchcock goes so far in one place as to speak of a "geological objection to Christianity"! We frankly and boldly assert, that the account of the creation in the book of Genesis might have been utterly lost, or be in most parts entirely incorrect, and uninspired in all its parts, and still the evidences of Christianity remain intact. Nay, we will say more: had the whole of the Old Testament been utterly destroyed, it would still be easy

to prove the authenticity and genuineness of the New Testament. We must enter our solemn protest, in behalf of the Gospel, against confounding it and its evidences with the book of Genesis, or with Judaism itself. It would be perfectly easy to prove the resurrection of Jesus, if we had no account of the creation, or could not explain the account which we have, or even tell whether it is inspired or not. We insist upon it, as demanded by accurate reasoning, as well as by justice to the Gospel, that its evidences shall not be mixed up with any geological or Mosaical cosmogonies.

We take leave of our author, impressed with the vigor of his mind, the originality and freshness and clearness of his views, and the reverential spirit in which he has handled doctrines which, though erroneous, are sacred to very many in the religious community. His book is a suggestive one, and will bear reading more than once. The author has made a valuable contribution to the cause of science and religion.

R. P. S.

## ART. IV.—SCHLEIERMACHER.\*

IN the year 1850 appeared at Berlin the last of the long series of Schleiermacher's theological and philosophical works. This volume contains even less than those which preceded it from Schleiermacher's own hand, being made up, for the most part, of notes of lectures taken nearly thirty years ago. It is probably *das letzte Wort des Verewigten*. The works cited below have the rare merit of having been committed to paper by the author himself, and the first two exhibit a grace and beauty of style which we seek in vain in his other

\* 1. *Über die Religion, Reden an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern.* 5te Auflage. Berlin. 1843.

2. *Monologen. Eine Neujahrsgabe.* Neue Ausgabe. Berlin. 1848.

3. *Der Christliche Glaube, nach den Grundsätzen der Evang.-Kirche, im Zusammenhang dargestellt, von DR. F. SCHLEIERMACHER.* (The references are made to the first edition of this work.)

4. *1ste und 2te Sendschreiben an Herrn Dr. Lucke, Werke, Th. I. Band II.*

productions. They contain the religious faith of Schleiermacher, and, considered together, have the advantage of presenting it in its most contradictory aspects. We propose to base upon them an estimate of his system and his claims to the gratitude of Protestant Christendom.

The best assurance that we have not undertaken a thankless task may be found in the words of the orthodox, but liberal Neander, that "the name of Schleiermacher marks an epoch of spiritual regeneration in the Church of Christ." Very many have found the fortress he has built *ein feste Burg* for their religious faith, the only defence tenable equally against supernaturalism and infidelity. Although his position was taken at a time when the course only of the speculative march was perceptible, and it was not yet well known that its weapons might be as dangerous to friends as to foes,—although the ramparts were thrown up and defended by the rebellious Pretorians themselves,—few strongholds have adhered to the cause so faithfully, and none have proved so safe and defensible.

It is only the repetition of an old experience, that every form of scepticism which has assailed Christianity with any effect has sprung out of the religion it attempted to overthrow, and has only been met successfully when its own weapons have been turned against itself. The transcendental philosophy is no exception. It is the legitimate child of the Protestant faith; it sprang out of her brain, armed in her defence. It has proved her most sharp, bitter, and persevering adversary. It became necessary that she should become skilled in the weapons of its logic and the phrases of its schools. It was necessary that some one in the camp should understand the language of the enemy, that she might learn their tactics, and make peace with them should an occasion offer. It is a service of which this is but the faint expression, that Schleiermacher has done for the faith in Christ. The Protestant Church, always turbulent with the conflicting elements of faith and reason, shifting from rationalism to supernaturalism, and offering a weak and divided front to the compact and unbroken line of her adversary, has found in him a reconciler of the discordant factions; he has sought to give her unity. He has sought to rear a platform of faith where all who take the

Scriptures as their guide can come together. Already his efforts are beginning to be crowned with success. He who founded no school, and desired nothing so little, is drawing all men after him by the depth of his wisdom and the sweetness of his piety. He did not write with a fitness of language limited to a nationality or a half-century; his "Dogmatics" will have a significance for all time; even now they form a necessary part of every thorough course of theological study; learned professors comment on and explain them in their winter semesters at Leipzig and Halle; "Schleiermacherian" students go from the orthodox universities of Prussia to preach in her pulpits, and, with all the unavoidable dissent among his followers, which he not only allowed, but encouraged, Schleiermacher is at this day, through his works, the ablest champion of a division which extends throughout Protestantism. Eighteen years have passed by since his death, and the number of his admirers has been constantly increasing; of those who confess that they owe to Schleiermacher either the depth of their faith, or the fervency of their religious feeling, or the liberality of a catholic spirit. They will be found wherever fortune shall bear this volume; wherever the Protestant religion is preached, there the author of "The Christian Faith" is at home. The name of the translator of Plato is a household word to the students of the most profound of Greek philosophers, and perhaps at some future day the champion of the "faith of feeling" will rank by the side of the few choice spirits whom the world delights to honor.

Beside his great natural powers, Schleiermacher owed his efficiency to two influences under which his life passed at different periods, and which infused into his character two apparently incongruous elements. It was this fortunate combination that enabled him to appeal to his age so successfully. Born at Breslau on the 21st of November, 1768, of Moravian parents, he was educated, with reference to the ministry, upon Moravian principles, and for nineteen years of his life was subject to Moravian discipline. His mind received at this time durable impressions, and his course of life a permanent direction; and although, when he arrived at years of mature thought, he threw off the trammels of that sect, he never

lost his affection for them, and it is not to be denied that the world owes to them much of the fervency and beauty of that piety which glows on every page of Schleiermacher's productions. Later circumstances threw him under the influence of the most iron intellect of the age, the second of the four great lights of German philosophy, and the result was a character plainly compounded of Fichtean philosophy and Moravian piety.

In a touching tribute of veneration Schleiermacher has indicated the peculiar service the Moravians rendered him in his religious life.

"Piety," says he in his dedication to Gustav von Brinkman,\* — "Piety was the maternal body in whose holy darkness my young life was cherished. In that my spirit lived ere it yet had found its proper province of action. She aided me, as I began to scrutinize my paternal faith, to purify my thoughts and feelings from the chaff of an earlier world. *She remained with me when the God and immortality of a childish period disappeared from my doubting eye.* She led me objectless into active life. She showed me how, both in success and failure, I should ever hold myself sacred in my individual existence, and through her alone have I learned friendship and love."

The Moravians deserved this high eulogy. The very atmosphere they breathed was religion. With a zeal that was almost morbid, they carried religion into the most petty details of life. Like our Puritan ancestry, they sought their amusements even in the offices of piety, and once a day they assembled for the reading of Scripture and the singing of hymns. Nowhere was the moral culture of youth so diligently cared for. Even before they could walk, they were carried to assemblies where they heard prayers and listened to sermons adapted to their comprehension. They were taught to sing, "I love my little papa, I love my little mamma, and brother, the little lamb; I love the dear angels, the little church, and my little heart." At a later age they were admitted to the *agapæ*, where they mingled gentle music with their religious meditations. Some of their hymns are devout beyond expression. They sought to strip death of its terror, and to make the anticipation of it as pleasant as possible. That one of their number was "gone

\* *Reden.* Also Christian Examiner for March, 1836, p. 10.

home to the Lord," was announced by solemn strains of music. At the burial of the dead, the corpse was laid in the ground with the sound of instruments and the chanting of verses. The graveyard was a favorite place of recreation.

The pliant nature of childhood, receiving its notions of religious matters from sensuous impressions, must have been powerfully affected by such a discipline as this, for good or for evil. Happy was he who could retain its spirit of fervent piety after "the God and immortality of his childish period had disappeared from the doubting eye." Such was the fortune of Schleiermacher. Its narrow creed could not long satisfy his bold and expanding mind, and he had but little more than commenced his theological studies at the Moravian institution at Barby, when he abruptly broke off his connection with that sect and established himself at Halle. But the religion of his childhood had done its work. It had given him an aim in life, and an object which, through all those stormy times, he pursued with inflexible determination. He lived and acted for religion. His achievements in philosophy, his philological accomplishments, his powerful oratory and gift of extemporaneous eloquence,—either sufficient in itself to have won him distinction,—were all pressed into the service of religion. He used them only to give new vitality to the Church. What the Moravians had taught him to be in youth, he remained through life, and gave every energy of body and of mind to the promotion of a pure Christian faith.

Having passed through the usual course of study at Halle, and the usual tedious years of pedagogy which await almost every German candidate, he was ordained as minister in 1794, and, after a few months' service as an assistant, began his career as preacher at the Charité Hospital at Berlin, a position not likely to bring him into notice, since his audience was not of a character to appreciate his remarkable intellectual powers.

The six years spent at this place offer evident traces of the second great forming influence through which his character passed. It was at this period that the reputation of the great successor of Kant was at its meridian. His *Wissenschaftslehre* had just been published. The whole reading world of Germany was following with

eager interest the development of his wonderful system. His manly boldness had raised up enemies on every side. Even with the friendly government of Weimar he became at last involved, and was expelled from Jena on the charge of atheism. A fortunate necessity directed his steps to Berlin. The exile, whom no other German state would receive, found in Prussia a safe home, and in the king a kind-hearted friend. "I accord him willingly," wrote Frederick William, "a residence in my dominions. Is it true that he has fallen into enmity with the dear God? Let the dear God settle it with him. With me it makes no difference."

It is impossible for us to trace fully the consequences of this residence at Berlin. The great Idealist was thrown much into the society of the two Schlegels, who were at that time editing the *Athenæum*. With Frederick Schlegel, the author of *Lucinde*, he was on terms of the most intimate friendship. There is a letter extant, dated July, 1799, and addressed to his wife, in which he says: "I am now at work on the *Bestimmung des Menschen*. At half past twelve I hold my toilet, (yes! get powdered, dressed, &c.,) and at one I call on M. Veit, where I meet Schlegel and a Reformed preacher, Schlegel's friend. . . . In the evening, I walk with Schlegel in the zoölogical gardens, or under the linden-trees before the house. Sometimes I make small country parties with Schlegel and his friends."

This letter has for us a peculiar interest, from the light which it throws upon the social relations in which Schleiermacher then lived. He was himself a contributor to the *Athenæum*. He it was, as yet unknown to fame, who is here spoken of as the "Reformed preacher, Schlegel's friend." We find him brought within the influence of Fichte's all-powerful mind at a time when he had entered the latest phase of his philosophic views, and while he was meditating the master work of that period. No one could come in personal contact with Fichte without the greatest enthusiasm for his genius and character. Schleiermacher never lost the traces of that intercourse. It was at this period, while he was daily listening to the conversation of Fichte, that he was preparing the most exquisite work on morality ever produced in the spirit of the Fichtean philosophy, and rivalled only by the *Be-*

*stimmung des Menschen* itself. Perhaps these interviews suggested to him a worthier object of labor than the fruitless translating of Blair and Fawcett.

It was the beautiful combination of these two elements in the character of Schleiermacher, that prepared him for the duty he immediately undertook, and insured his success. It was necessary, from the nature of the case, that Fichte should precede him; that the success of philosophy apart from dogma should be established, before he could give to dogma the dignity of an existence entirely independent on philosophy. This work, which it was his good fortune to complete, had already been begun by the pietists of a former century, of whose spirit he had received by inheritance. When, therefore, in 1810, he was called to a chair of theology in the new University at Berlin, whose plan had been drafted by Fichte, and whose organization marks an epoch of moral and political regeneration, and may be considered as the triumph of a religion which assumed to itself and subjected to its uses the philosophic elements of the age, the commission belonged to Schleiermacher already by the gift of Providence.

He had come out of Moravianism as if with the buried spirit of Spener within him, and the "faith of feeling" was destined to watch over the birth of the second, as it had already watched over that of the first, great school of Prussia. It was the loss of Halle by the peace of Tilsit that called Berlin into existence. The University at Halle had been founded in a spirit of reform one hundred years before that at Berlin, and fifty years before Count Zinzendorf planted his colony on the Hutberg of Berthelsdorf. The leader of this movement was the distinguished Thomasius of Leipzig. The heretical Dr. Francke, a favorite disciple of Spener, was called to a chair of theology. Spener was a fervid pietist and re-former. He was a hater of creeds, and a bold exposer of religious corruptions. He travelled from one end of Germany to the other, proclaiming his views from the pulpit, and by his *Pia Desideria* after a reform of the true Evangelical Church, he succeeded in setting the whole Fatherland by the ears. We have the authority of Menzel, in his "German Literature," for believing that "the faith of feeling, promoted by Spener, after it

had acquired popularity, immediately isolated itself in the Moravian sect, founded by Count Zinzendorf in the beginning of the last century, and so far ceased for a time to exert an influence on the Protestant Church." If, then, we have traced our Arethusa stream correctly, it is the same fountain gushing in successive centuries at Halle and at Berlin. The spirit which inspired Francke lent its influence to the moulding of Schleiermacher. The "faith of feeling," which seemed to have perished all over the world, had retired to the friendly protection of the Moravian Church, there to bide its time and to serve the world when an opportunity should offer. Its reappearance in Schleiermacher was the evidence of his divine commission to address his age.

As, however, such a commission is not one that would be likely to satisfy the powers that hold professorships at their disposal, we must rather seek the effective claims of Schleiermacher in the wide-spread reputation which the eleven years succeeding the first interview with Fichte had gained him. Our "Reformed preacher" had published his Discourses on Religion, Monologues, and Christian Ethics, had been made professor at Halle, had been driven from his chair by the French invasion, had received a pulpit in Berlin, and had preached most inflammatory sermons in the ears of the French Marshal. He was commended to the cabinet by his earnest patriotism and the fame of his learning and eloquence. Invited to enter a circle of the most brilliant men in the kingdom, he lost nothing by comparison with them. It was the fortune of that University to secure in the outset of its career three men who are called, in the language of the times, "epoch-making men." They were Niebuhr, Savigny, and Schleiermacher. Other men of distinguished merit, and second only to them, were united with them, and the University at Berlin assumed at once, in its first semester, that prominent position which it has ever since retained.

If we turn now to the condition of the society Schleiermacher was to appeal to and reform, we shall find it on the one side lost in formalism and the torpidity of a lifeless religious system, and on the other, as a natural consequence, incredulous and reluctant to become actors in a farce for the benefit of the state. It was the blooming

period of German poetry. Yet, to a certain extent, this was an influence which a reformer had to contend against; for the cold, unlovable, though idolized Goethe was not a man to satisfy the religious wants of the race, nor was the questionable morality of his life one which it was safe to extend to the sphere of less polished intellects, less discriminating tastes, and more ardent passions. "The Nazarene peasant may think himself fortunate," said the disciples of Goethe, "if he receives a condescending approval from the lips of our prophet."

The revival of philosophy, and the progress of metaphysical discrimination, was a marked feature of the times. The powers of the human mind were receiving a searching analysis such as they had never received before, and the ethereal speculations of such an intellect as Fichte's were uniting a pantheistic conception of God with a stoical morality, exemplified in a life which rose to the moral sublime. The divergence between philosophy and — not religion, but — Christianity was growing wider, and the times demanded a reconciler.

And, finally, it was an age of violent political convulsion and unparalleled domestic calamity, naturally predisposing men to return to those essential and fundamental truths of religion which are the sole possible consolation for many of the inexplicable ills of life.

To meet such a state of society as this, and to answer its wants, the mind of Schleiermacher was eminently well adapted. Religion had fallen into discredit, and was flippantly passed over to women and weak-minded men by those who prided themselves on the keenness of their wit, the temper of their courage, and their entire freedom from superstition. Schleiermacher refused to enter those more attractive walks of life where, all must admit, he would have shone preëminent, and bore into the service of religion a versatility of talent, a refinement of culture, in a word, a genius, such as was adorning the walks of literature, philosophy, and natural science. His personal character was likely to make the priesthood a respected and honored office. He was the Loyola of a sinking system, as energetic, as courageous, and as successful as the devoted Jesuit. There ran through his whole career a thread of singleness of purpose. The bitter opponent of false, and the earnest champion of

what he esteemed to be true religion, he threw himself in the path of the popular spirit of infidelity, and his first original words on the literary arena — words which will of themselves establish his claim to the highest rank in the world of letters — were those noble “Discourses upon Religion, addressed to Educated Sceptics.” Schleiermacher was still a young man when he made this effort, and known to the public only as the translator of two volumes of French sermons, and as a contributor to the *Athenaeum*. But the Discourses from the pen of the *Charite* preacher were one of those few instances in which such disinterested labors are repaid with tangible results. The author lived to see what he considered a transient pamphlet, “too much penetrated with the spirit of the times for permanent existence,” take its rank among the classics of German literature. Near twenty years afterward, when the earlier editions had been completely exhausted, and the avidity of the public consumed two new editions in a single year, he remarked with some *naiveté* in his preface, that “the persons to whom his words had been addressed seem to be no longer before him.” Conclusive proof that his efforts had not been without their reward.

Before these Gallios of Prussia, our young apostle of reform opens his mouth, and speaks with studied grace the honeyed words of conciliation. Whatever discrepancies there may seem to be between the works of this period and his later views, he persisted to his dying day that there is nothing in them he could wish recalled or changed.

The first chapter of the “Discourses” is one of “Justification.”

“It may seem an unexpected effort at which you will wonder,” he says, “if yet another demand of you, who stand so far above the common level and are so penetrated with the wisdom of centuries, a hearing upon a subject which you have neglected so utterly. I confess, too, that I see no reason to hope so fortunate an issue of my efforts as to win your applause; or, what would be more fortunate, to breathe into you my feelings, and an inspiration for my cause. For faith has never been every man’s possession, and it has been always true that few only have known religion itself, while millions have amused themselves in various ways with the garbs it has consented to assume. The

life of men of letters in these times, however, is far from any semblance of religion. I know that you honor the Deity in your retirement just as little as you visit the forsaken temples ; that in your dwellings no other objects of reverence are found than the prudent sayings of our wise men and the beautiful conceptions of our artists, and that humanity and social life and art and science have so fully occupied your attention, that you have no thoughts left for that eternal and pure Being who lives, to you, beyond the world. I know that you have made life on earth so beautiful that you require no eternity. You are convinced that nothing new can be said on this subject, which has been satisfactorily discussed by philosophers and seers, and, may I not add, by scoffers and priests. From the last, at least, you have no desire to hear. They have been long declared unworthy of your confidence, because they love best to dwell in the storm-beaten ruin of their sanctuary ; nor can they even rest there quietly, without adding to the work of destruction. I know all this, and yet, impelled by an inward, an irresistible necessity, I must speak, and I cannot retract the invitation that precisely you should hear me." — p. 1.

Such a people required such a priest. Protestantism, eternally changing religion, needed him, for the great reformation which had led men back to the sacred writings again had fallen too much into a system of verbal criticism, a narrow adherence to the letter. "Life, life, some vital principle!" was the imploring cry of the religious world. Protestantism had none to give. The hungry and thirsty wayfarers found the fig-trees without fruit, and the cistern broken and without water,—deception all. It would seem that at such a time, and under such conditions of the moral atmosphere, scepticism is a natural growth, and by no means the sign of a diseased organization. So Schleiermacher considered it, when, without ranking himself with either of the great parties into which the theological world was divided, without appearing as the champion of a school or a sect, he led his readers back to first principles, and talked of religion as Plato might have done, or a Hindoo sage. From these first principles he conducted them slowly up to Christianity, as the most perfect form which the religious element in the human soul has ever assumed. The wisdom of his course was proved by the ease with which he thus obtained a hearing. It has not, however, escaped severe censure, and uncharitable inferences have been

drawn from it in regard to the author's views, that emanate either from the obstinacy of prejudice, or from minds that are not broad enough to grasp such a system as Schleiermacher's was, and the greatness of a commission which did not fear nor disdain to invade, in the service of religion, every department of human thought. He spoke to men who could not be indoctrinated on the instant in all the truths of a system which had slowly become part and parcel of his own nature. He was even drawn to them by a heartfelt sympathy with their aversion; for, like them, he could not receive a system which had nothing to offer but the dry husks of doctrine. Page after page glows with indignation at such a practical hostility to Christianity on the part of its professed friends, and with a heart warm with such a feeling as this, he takes the sceptic by the hand, and pleads with him. He uses the same kind of tact which the missionary on the Coromandel shore uses with the Hindoo. He employs the same privilege which Paul employs on Mars' Hill, where the man who was "all things to all men" speaks with more elegant and philosophic diction, and adorns his oratory with a quotation from a native poet. And we should as soon think of discovering a tendency toward Paganism in the author of *Telemachus*, as of accusing the author of the *Monologues* and *Reden* of that scepticism with which he so often manifests his sympathy.

These Discourses, addressed to a generation sceptical by instinct, devote their whole strength to the analysis of the religious element in the human soul, to its claims and culture. The ground they pass over lies *between* scepticism and Christianity, and bordering at each extremity upon both. They are discourses pronounced, as some one has said, in the outside court of the temple, not in the temple itself. But in them are the principles that are the life of Christianity, and without which it cannot survive a moment, and nowhere, we venture to say, have they been more completely analyzed, or more sublimely vindicated. In them religion comes to the elegant and refined in the garb of elegance and refinement. She ventures to take upon her lips the phrases of the schools. She appears in the groves among the astonished disciples, in the garb of an Academician. She

says, "Even here I do not disdain to come, for there is no place in the universe where I am not," and she reasons with them in their own language, and converts them with their own arguments. There is just that difference between these productions of Schleiermacher and the "Christian Faith" of his maturer years, which would naturally spring from the different ends they have in view, — a difference, not a discrepancy. There is, perhaps, in the speeches and letters of Paul quite as much variety. The truth is, that the coldness and dogmatism of the Church were just as repulsive to Schleiermacher as to the man who had been made by them an enemy to Christianity. He is sometimes put in a false light, because in those days his indignation toward a system which he conceived to be doing more harm than good induced him to use toward the Church the same reproaches which her most bitter enemies were using.

This very position compelled him to become a reformer, and his natural boldness made him a thorough and unsparing one. Unlike that obnoxious class who are adepts at pulling down and tyros at replacing, who undermine existing institutions only to look at the ruin with their hands in their pockets, Schleiermacher put up new houses for man's religious faith after he had been driven from the old weather-beaten domain. Strauss speaks of his labors as follows: — "In place of the roomy old castle, with its nooks and towers, its halls and corridors, in whose rich but uncomfortable rooms, with their old-fashioned furniture, we were daily growing more discontented, and whose wings, as they fell one after another, we were obliged to desert and abandon to destruction, — in place of this, there now stands a new pavilion at our service, built in the modern style, and furnished with equal convenience and elegance. No wonder that the old Rat's Nest (as ingratitude began to style it) was deserted by all its inhabitants, with the exception of a few old house cats, while all conveyed themselves to the new structure."

Apart from its levity and its disrespectful allusion to the champions of evangelical orthodoxy, the figure correctly represents the service of our reformer. Without raising a hand against the dilapidated structure, he drew his countrymen to the comfortable faith he presented for

their use, as swarming bees are drawn to a hive, or spring birds to their boxes. The egotism which makes fault-finding in church or state a hobbyhorse to ride into notice, was not in Schleiermacher. He gave men, at least, the chance of choice, and asked no one to give up what he had, if something better were not offered him. A worthy example for all so-called reformers.

Already, in the Discourses the characterizing elements of the system he proposes may be detected, giving point and weight to his words as he appeals to all the manly feelings and honorable sentiments of honest doubt. There probably can be no more hostile foe to religion than the conviction, that it is fashionable and manly to scout it; that it is as necessary to a gentleman to discard that weakness, as it is to be able to criticize the opera, or to dress in the mode; that literary culture and refined tastes are as incompatible with religious faith as with a boorish dialect or boorish manners. And this, as we have seen, was the state of things at that dismal period. It reminds us of those times Herder speaks of, when George Sabinus travelled in Italy. "The Cardinal Bembo put various questions to him about Melancthon, how many hearers he had, and what pay,—and by and by what he thought of the resurrection of the dead and immortal life. When Sabinus replied to him out of Melancthon's writings, the Cardinal answered, 'I should have held him to be a keener man had he not believed this.'" There were and there are now in the world thousands of miserable sceptics, for no other reason save the fear that this may be said of them. To such victims of dilettanteism the Discourses said, Are you quite sure you are not exposing yourselves when you raise this great outcry against religion? Are you not letting the world see how really one-sided and imperfect your culture is, since you have overlooked such an important part of your natures? It is against nature to eradicate it. It has claims to a place in the heart where there is warmth and sunlight, and you must loosen the soil about it, and give it such opportunities of growth as your intellects have, or your affections. Such was the opinion of a man who was himself a scholar and a philosopher, a man whose sympathies with the ultra tendencies of the age could induce him to write letters in commendation

of Frederick Schlegel's *Lucinde* in the same breath in which he appeared as the adherent and champion of despised Christianity! He separated religion from aesthetic culture, and taught the world, by its perceptions of the beautiful in art and nature, to be led to the reverence of virtue as the most beautiful thing in the universe. He separated religion from knowledge, and taught the world that she can minister only as the handmaiden of piety: she cannot even feed the fires that flame upon the sacred altars; she clears only the dim eye of the ministering priestess. He taught them that knowledge is like oil on the sea of religious emotion, which soothes the troubled waters till they give back the whole image of God, not a broken and partial reflection. And, finally, over all the objects of human culture, and as worthy the most attentive study of the philosophic mind, he places religion. On men of scholarly tastes, brilliant parts, and thorough refinement,—on these above all, religion has claims. She ranks high among the proper objects of philosophic speculation, and partial indeed is that man's development who has overlooked her rank and spoke slightly of her importance.

In the course of half a century, these views have reached us from time to time, through different sources, and become familiar. In those days the position was novel, and it required a bold heart to clear away the ground to make room for it. It was defended with as much skill and courage as it had required to assume it. But not only on the side of the scoffers; it was open to attack from disaffected religionists,—from men whom, of all others, Schleiermacher could not endure, and against whom he opens the batteries of his most bitter sarcasm; from those men of the world whose Christianity is an outside garment, worn because it presents a respectable appearance and helps a man through the world,—to whom Christianity is a balance-wheel in the state, a restraint in society,—who support it on the same ground on which they support a company of firemen or of mutual assurance. Probably, if any men are hindrances to the spread of Christ's religion more than others, these are the ones. These are they who magnify little things into important matters, casual "coverings" of religion into essential principles. Every man knows what kind of Christians

these are, for in whatever society our religion becomes dominant they are sure to make their appearance. They are parasites of Christianity, as any thing in power has parasites, even the Marchioness of Pompadour, daughter of a peasant and pander of Louis the Fifteenth, and their support is about as valuable as that of the rest of their class. They use Christianity to keep the state in order and stocks at par, and no doubt find her very serviceable for that purpose. But so soon as this serviceable machine manifests any sign of vitality, and begins to think and act for itself, a great outcry is raised. Without tracing any more definitely these well-known lineaments, we will only say that such a class was to be found among the churches of Prussia, and that Schleiermacher thought he discovered in them the dead weight upon the heart of Christianity; oppressed by them, pulsation had almost ceased, and vital action almost departed. He drives them out of the precincts of religion, as Jesus drove the money-changers from the court of the temple. In the new system no nook or corner is left where they can take their stand and interrupt the meditations and prayers of piety by the noise of chaffering and the clamors of barter.

"Who hinders the spread of religion? Not you, not the doubters and deriders, even though you *would* prefer no religion, for it is at a later period in life that your influences find a receiving soil. You cannot destroy nature while she continues to generate piety from the inmost depths of the heart. Neither is it the immoral, as men generally suppose, who impede most the spread of religion. Her struggle and contest is with a very different power. The intelligent, practical men of to-day, they in the present condition of the world are the worst foes of religion, and their overpowering superiority explains why she plays so poor and miserable a part. Even from the tender childhood, they maltreat the nature, and suppress its aspiration toward the higher."\*

And again:—

"The defenders of religion wish her to manifest her usefulness,—what humiliation! High honor for the free and untrammelled one, that she can sharpen the consciences of men a little, and make them a little more watchful. For no such purpose does

---

\* *Über die Rel.*, p. 149.

she descend from heaven. . . . I affirm that piety springs necessarily and of its own accord out of the depths of every good soul; that a peculiar province belongs to her in our nature, where she governs without hindrance; that she is every way worthy to be received by the noblest and most exalted, and to be assumed by them into their inmost being, and to be recognized by them."

In order to set before our readers the distinguishing feature of the Schleiermacherian doctrine, its view of the essential nature of religion, a little more clearly, we pass from the popular Discourses to the scientific Christian Faith. The clauses we quote are from the Introduction, and are the foundation theorems on which the superstructure is built.\* The 8th proposition of the first book reads: "Piety in itself is neither knowledge nor action, but a disposition (*Neigung*) and state (*Bestimmtheit*) of the feeling." The 9th: "The common substance of all pious emotions, i. e. the essence of piety, is this,—that we are conscious of ourselves as absolutely dependent, i. e. that we feel ourselves as dependent on God." The 18th: "Christianity is a peculiar form of piety in its theological aspect, which form is distinguished from all others in this, that all things are referred to the consciousness of redemption through the person of Jesus of Nazareth." The 38th: "The recognition of the dependence feeling, as a condition of life, *takes the place with us of the proof of all being of a God, which finds no footing in our experience.*"

This was sufficiently subjective for the most ultra Transcendentalist. "In order," says the 6th proposition, "to understand in what the essence of Christianity consists, we must go out of Christianity and take our position above it." As in the Cartesian philosophy, every thing which has hitherto been accomplished by human powers is cleared away before we can find the little spot on which we are to take our stand. Grant us, then, one little principle, and God and the universe will be built for us in a new and more permanent manner. Let us suppose that, in the nature of man, as the eye distinguishes colors, as the ear receives sounds, as the intellect discerns truth, so there is a moral sense which discerns

---

\* They are the *πονηρῶν* in the religious experience of philosophers as widely diverse as J. D. Morell and Theodore Parker (Phil. of Rel., Ch. 3; Disc. of Rel., B. I. Ch. 1).

God, in other words, let us suppose that we have in *feeling* a form of subjective knowledge which corresponds to the absolute, and we have the keystone of Schleiermacher's dogmatic system. In this "*feeling*," we have the whole of religion. No practical side is conceded to it; no action springs from it; but, "While none springs out of religion, all should be done and accomplished with religion. The religious feelings, unbroken, like a strain of holy music, should accompany man's active life, and nowhere should he be without it." "If," said Hegel, criticizing this position with more severity than fairness,— "if religion consisted in the feeling of infinite dependence, the *dog* would be the best Christian." The reader can question his own consciousness whether there be no difference between the dependence feeling indicated by Schleiermacher and that of the lower orders of creation.

Schleiermacher was himself a transcendental philosopher of no mean reputation; but the main object of his speculation was, to rescue religion from the sweeping conclusions of that vague and uncertain philosophy. In the inner consciousness he wished to secure a point of tenure from the dashings of its yeasty waves for the beacon of religion, and he died in the belief that he had done so. All honor to the noble spirit that inspired his labors! At first a disciple of Fichte, he advanced further than Fichte had dared;—at one time, he almost stood on the identity ground of Schelling, and reached back a hand to the "*god-intoxicated*" philosopher of Holland. "Offer with me reverently," said he to the sceptics, "a lock to the *manes* of the saintly, rejected Spinoza. Him penetrated the sublime world-spirit. The Infinite was his beginning and end, the Universe his only and eternal love. . . . Full of religion was he, and of a holy spirit, therefore stands he there alone and unreached, master in his art, but far above the profane guild, without disciples and without citizenship."\* Yet it is one thing to praise the spirit and character of a philosopher, and another to become his disciple; and however nearly this exclusive mode of discovering the divine may border upon pantheism, however unsatisfactory it may be

\* *Über die Rel.*, p. 48.

in its conclusions in relation to the Divine nature, however incomplete a view it may give us of the Deity, Schleiermacher was not a pantheist,—not in any portion of his life,—and those who dissented from him were unjust in styling him one. Even had he been led so far, in obedience to the convictions of his philosophic system, he would have been worthy our respect and reverence for his struggles to rescue the religious element from the dangers of that frivolous atheism toward which the current of speculation was at that time sweeping. The philosophy which Schleiermacher first received admitted no religion. It was by nature antipathetical to it. The *Bestimmung des Menschen* presents us a stoical morality, the *Anweisung zum seligen Leben* an effort at religion. But what affectionate relations can there be toward a Deity of moral order, or what of that beautiful weakness before the Divine Omnipotence in the pitiless stoicism of Fichte! Schleiermacher did this for philosophy. On the one side, he had partially yielded his assent to an idealism the most thorough and sweeping the world had as yet seen,—an absolutism of the subjective self. On the other side, finding himself unable to accept its extreme conclusions, he had been compelled to return to the primitive system of Kant, which admitted the reality of an objective world. To reconcile the discrepancy between the two, he assumed a primitive substance common to them both, a substance in which the difference of idealism and realism disappears, an essence in whose nature the dualism of the world of our experience does not exist. It was precisely in this direction that the great philosophers afterward followed. But it is no more than fairness to acknowledge that the path never was trodden by Schleiermacher over the borders of pantheism. He did not hold, with Spinoza, that the divine substance enters into all finite things, and is itself composed of them. He held, on the contrary, that the world stands in contrast with the Absolute, and is in no sense identical with it.\* With this absolute being, he held that there is no connection by will, or thought, or knowledge, or any other means, save through the feeling of dependence.

---

\* See Chalabäus, *Entwickelung d. Phil.*, p. 217, 4th ed., who thinks this position involves a contradiction.

This was the impregnable position on which he wished to place religion, the warp of philosophy on which he wrought with such elegance and beauty. To return again to the more popular and oratorical expressions of the Discourses :—

“The universe exists in an unbroken action, and discloses itself to us at each moment. Each form which it produces, each being to which, according to the fulness of its life, it gives a separate existence, each event which it shakes out of its rich and ever-fruitful lap, is an action of the same upon us ; and in these influences, and in that which makes its appearance in us through their means, to receive each isolated part, not for itself, but as a part of the whole, each finite not in its opposition to another, but as a representation of the infinite in our life, and to permit ourselves to be influenced by them, that is religion.”\*

This is what Menzel would call making religion “genteel and respectable.”† We think nobody will deny our right to do so, if we do not compromise the truth. We should be unwilling to believe that the religion of Christ is not susceptible of being made “genteel and respectable,” and that it is so constituted that it can make no appeal to “the cultivated,” as Menzel seems to presuppose. The great fault which the Church has found with this theory has been its pantheistic tendency. She forgets that it was a plank of salvation to those who were being swallowed up in the idealism of the period. She forgets that the author himself expressly disclaimed all such views, and that he employed his best energies in diffusing doctrines totally incompatible with pantheism. The Church evidently misunderstood Schleiermacher. It is doubtful whether, so long as we have a Christian faith professed and exhibited in the life, we have a right to inquire beyond and ascend to the conceptions of the Deity. If we see the luxuriant foliage, and the flowers and fruits, why need we scrutinize the support to which the tendrils are clinging which we cannot plainly see ? What is pantheism ? How shall a subtle intellect which does for a devout heart the office of conceiving and defining escape that imputation ? A base mind, which worships with the most devout and childlike faith, may

\* *Über die Rel.*, p. 57.

† *Geschichte der Deutschen*, p. 1044, 3d ed.

find its god in an idol fashioned from a tree or a stone, or in a king reigning in the heavens, or in some indefinable majesty withdrawn to some distant quarter of the universe; but a finer intellect shrinks from the attempt to grasp and define an omnipresence. So closely does that vivid faith which sees God in every thing, to whose conceptions of divine oversight nothing happens which escapes its watchful care, which finds the hand of God in the revolutions of earth, in the growth and decay of the animal and vegetable worlds, in the mental development of the human race, in life and in death, so closely does it border on the language and conceptions of pantheism, that it is extremely difficult to draw the line of demarcation. The Christian who gives way to his religious emotions, and leaves the cares of the world behind him, and rises on the wings of prayer to an intercourse with God, does not for the moment, in respect to his emotion, materially differ from the Indian Sannyasi who strives to free his soul from corporeal influences, and bathe himself in the pure essence of the Deity. "*Glaubst du an Gott?* Believest thou in God?" says Marguerette. "My dear," replies Faust, "who dares to say, I believe in God? Who dares to name him, and to profess, I believe in him? Who feels and can bring himself to say, I believe him not? The All-embracer, the All-sustainer, does he not embrace, sustain, support thee, me, himself? Yonder does not the vault of heaven overarch us? Here does not the earth lie firmly beneath? Do not the eternal stars ascend, friendly glancing? Eye in eye do I not look into thee, and on head and heart does not the All press, and visibly and invisibly weave itself about thee in an eternal mystery? Great as thy heart is, fill it with this, and when thou art quite happy in the feeling, name it what thou wilt,—Happiness, Heart, Love, God. I have no name for it. Feeling is all. Name is sound and smoke veiling the glow of the heavens."

Whatever Goethe may have intended to illustrate by this magnificent passage, it is with a feeling akin to this that all finer minds shrink from passing certain limits, and drawing too near the sacred presence of the God-head. There is a mystery about it, devout men cannot and will not ask to penetrate. And when they enter the

Divine presence, it is not with a curiosity which desires to analyze, but with a heart which adores. To them, "feeling is all," while "name is sound and smoke." They know, by the testimony of their yearning hearts, that God is, and they worship in obedience to the dictates of their own irresistible feelings. In such a spirit Schleiermacher wrote.

"It must seem natural that, as God is depicted in the conception more like man, an opposite mode of representation will more readily arise, a conception of the Supreme Being, not as a thinking and willing person, but as the general necessity, standing above all personality, and producing and uniting all thought and being; and nothing can be more unseemly than when the holders of one view accuse those who, frightened by their material views, take flight to the other extreme, of being godless, or when the holders of the other accuse their antagonists of idolatry, and declare their piety worthless on account of their gross conceptions. At either extreme we may retain our piety. But see how limited the Godhead is presented in the one, and how cold and dead in the other! And just as neither corresponds to its object, so neither can be any proof of piety unless something underlies it in the heart. Rightly understood, however, each represents an element at least of the *feeling*, and both are worthless if that is not there. Is it not evident that very many believe and confess such a God, and are nothing less than pious, and that this conception is never the seed out of which piety can grow, because it has no life in itself, but only receives it from the *feeling*? "\*

At any rate, Schleiermacher's pantheism, if such it was, became harmless by retaining its conviction of our personal immortality and our personal responsibility. Nowhere can we find in him that destructive theory that death severs again "being and thought," annihilates our consciousness, and returns us without personality to the great source of being.

His theory of the origin and the nature of religion is the only one which is at once satisfactory and tenable. The world awakens every child of God to those aspirations which belong to a religious being. Everywhere man and the Infinite stand over against each other as sense and object, and religion consists in the constant

---

\* *Über die Rel.*, p. 114.

admission of that object through its proper avenue into the soul. In religion, man is passive. The beauty of that diviner and greater presence engages him.

But it is not all of life to yield us unresisting to the gentle current of emotion. There is an inward necessity of our nature which drives us to action. There is a power of individuality which struggles against a passive surrender and asserts its entire freedom. Strangely compounded with this ultra pietism is a stoicism almost run mad. The Monologues, even more beautifully written than the *Bestimmung des Menschen*, are the echo of its principles. They need no analysis, and will submit to none. They must be read and felt. We commend them to all who admire sublime philosophy and exquisite composition, to all who lack the courage to assert their own independence, and the boldness to struggle against the world, and to refuse to be moulded by circumstances. From this point of survey self is every thing, and its sceptre has no limit. Want of self-reliance is the only sin, inward power and force of character the only good. Who will not admire this estimate of life?

"In every thing I hold *Freedom* to be primary, first and foremost. When I return into myself to contemplate her, my glance is no longer in the province of Time, and free from the trammels of Necessity. Every oppressive feeling of servitude gives way, the spirit perceives its creative essence, the light of divinity rises within me, and drives back the mist in which others sadly wander astray. And how I find myself again, how by contemplation I recognize myself again, does not depend on chance or fortune, nor on how many happy hours I have garnered, nor on what is furthered and established by my action, nor on how *the will has succeeded in its outward manifestation*, for all that is certainly not I, it is only the world.\*

Thus far we have pursued the attempt to place religion upon an abstract basis which can be shaken by no conclusions of philosophy and no denial of historical events. Is there such a subjective ground upon which that which is peculiarly *Christian* can be established, where its inmost essence shall be safe beyond the reach of either rationalism or supernaturalism? The abstract principles assumed in the outset imposed upon

---

\* *Monologen*, p. 15.

Schleiermacher the necessity of finding such a ground, and he has accomplished the task with great adroitness, if not with perfect success.

What is it that essentially constitutes Christianity ? The comparison of the various forms of religion with each other shows them invariably differing in two respects, viz. in their historic origin and in their dogmatic form. In both respects Christianity marks itself out from all other religions, and we cannot surrender either of these peculiarities without endangering its existence.

Its life is so inwoven with some *facts* that are to it essentially true, that separate from these facts it ceases to be itself. The Christian history ascends to Christ, not to Mohammed, Socrates, or Moses, and it could not be transferred to any other person without destroying Christianity. It places at the head of its history Jesus of Nazareth, a being pure and sinless. Here is the limit of the essential. It is true that his life has been minutely depicted, and wonderful events narrated, which manifest his superhuman power ; it is true that all the powers of word-painting, all the inspirations of prophecy, have been exhausted to present with brilliancy and effect the earliest period of his life, in which it is now an undoubted fact that we have little foothold of certainty. But all this is incidental. It does not touch the main point. Its loss would not affect the historical credibility of our religion. That religion is not connected with the person of Christ because of the good he did in Judea and Galilee, because of his sympathy with suffering, his kindness to the sick, his readiness to alleviate pain and assuage grief. These contribute to form a beautiful character, which is worthy of reverence, but they do not present the essential element of a religious faith ; and the unity of the Christian Church centres not in the outward events of his life, but in the great office which he performed and is still performing for the human race. So small is the basis of historic truth that is left for science to tamper with.

In the next place, every religion evolves from itself certain peculiar *doctrines*. It is the law of its life to produce these doctrines. They come forth naturally, and bear the hue and beauty ordained to them and them only. They are not produced by reasoning from abstract

principles, but they are evolved by the religious consciousness trained under given circumstances and in certain social conditions. They present to us peculiar views of the relation of man to his Creator, each religion offering a different shade, as the prism offers a different ray according to the angle of incidence. With every change of that relation we have a change in human feelings, and a view of duty and life that is its peculiar product.

In this respect, the essential feature of a Christian faith\* is to be found in the consciousness of our redemption by Jesus Christ, of a sinless principle imparted by him to the life of man, of our introduction to an entirely new relation to the Creator, and of our right to cast our faith upon a Deity at once paternal and lovable. This consciousness has no connection with history. It is imparted through the Church. But since it could not be the result of the reciprocal influence of imperfect men upon each other, it leads us back to the perfect Christ as its author. This office of Christ forms the proper conclusion of the speculations that have introduced us to it. It fills the vacant gap in the religious system we have been surveying. Erected by a Christian spirit, the niche which no philosophy could fill, like the window in Aladdin's palace, seemed to show that the power which raised was alone adequate to complete it. We have seen, on the one side, the divine nature swiftly expanding into the objective pantheism of Spinoza, and, on the other, the individual me in its proud isolation swiftly expanding into the subjective pantheism of Fichte. Here is a discrepancy which philosophy cannot reconcile. In the darkness of nature, conscience and self struggle with each other, and find but an imperfect reconciliation in sacrifices, purifications, consecrations. It was at a moment of history when all efforts had been made, and despair was beginning to supervene in the form of the coldest scepticism and the utter helplessness of a want of all faith,—it was at this moment, when nothing could save the world but a light from without, that such a light was granted. Christ came to bring the eternal life into quickening union with the soul of man, to bridge over the gulf that lay between the human and divine, to teach

---

\* Comp. *Glb. Lehre*, Thl. I. sec. 17 ff.

man how to repose his weakness on the strength of God, and to reconcile the eternal abhorrence of sin with the constant love of a father. The words of the Apostle Paul, "God hath reconciled us to himself by Jesus Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation, to wit, that God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself,"\* present to us the great element of a Christian faith, a truth original and sublime. To receive that truth in the heart as a subject of faith and experience, to feel that Christ has performed this office for the world and for him, is the holy and happy consciousness which unites man with Christ and makes him his disciple.

He who completed that reconciliation, who so strengthened the consciousness of God in the breast of man, could himself have needed no reconciler. He must have been above the taint of mortal sin or weakness. Through his divine perfection he became the Saviour of the world. We vainly seek in history for the power to depict that character save under limitations. In the subjective consciousness, it shines forth radiant and complete. Thus Schleiermacher, accepting himself the Gospel accounts as entirely authentic, and zealously using his pen in their defence, sought to preserve for the rationalist a place by his side on the platform of Christian faith. Believing in the miraculous histories, he seems to have viewed them as instruments employed to establish a system which is now strong enough to maintain itself on its own merits. It was the *ideal* Christ that was the centre of his Christianity, with whose divine office the facts in history have the slightest possible necessary connection.†

Thus we have found our prophet to the last the reconciler between rationalism and supernaturalism. It was in view of the elevated spirituality of his doctrine, that Neander ‡ compared him with the English Coleridge.

\* 2 Cor. v. 18, 19.

† Strauss (*Life of Jesus*, London ed., Vol. III. p. 417) has a clear analysis of this Christology.

‡ "Perhaps the impulse which the American mind has received from the profound Coleridge, who, like Schleiermacher among ourselves, has testified that Christianity is not so much a definite system of conceptions as a power of life, may have contributed, and may still further contribute, to prepare the way for a new tendency of scientific theology in your beloved country." — *Life of Christ*, Pref. to Amer. ed.

True, he had all of Coleridge's versatility of genius, but the elements of his character were far more stable and decided. He had a fixedness of purpose, the want of which caused the genius of the English philosopher to evaporate in pointed sayings. Coleridge has left little behind him save personal reminiscences and broken fragments. Schleiermacher, on the other hand, has become (in spite of himself, for, in his respect for individuality, he wished no servile imitators around him) the founder of a school in constant and vigorous growth. So wonderful were his powers of labor, that, beside the faithful performance of his professional duty, he has bequeathed to posterity many volumes of excellent sermons, many volumes upon Christian morals and history, many volumes of philosophical essays, and a complete translation of Plato! Though endowed with but a weak physical organization, and constantly struggling against disease, such was his strength of will, that, (we quote the words of an intimate friend,) "in labors and journeys, in official activity and social life, the body was always compelled to submit and to serve his purpose. In foot rambles he was ever foremost, at night the last in bed, and in the morning the earliest on the route. I have known him, when troubled with severe pain, to preach and lecture, and no one could perceive his suffering. I have often seen him in society late at night, the most cheerful and lively of all: it could not last too long for him, though at six in the morning he was to lecture or to preach."\* This constant mental activity explains the amount of labor accomplished in his lifetime. His lectures cost him reflection only; and such was his wonderful command of language, that he entered his pulpit on Sunday with his subject only in his head, trusting to the occasion for his inspiration. None of his sermons were previously written. They have come to us from the hands of reporters.

This great man opened the week with an extemporaneous effort at early dawn, which drew crowds of eager listeners. The working days were filled with the duties of a parish, the catechizing of youth, lectures upon philosophy or dogmatics or exegesis, and those social en-

---

\* Dr. Lücke, *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1834. Christian Examiner, 1836.

gagements by which a prominent German professor draws around him his clique of devoted disciples. He bore up under a complicated burden of labors, either one of which would have been sufficient for an ordinary man, and nowhere was he satisfied with mediocrity. He excelled equally in all. His position as a religious reformer has occupied our attention, but so remarkable was the variety of his attainments and the completeness of his culture, that he presents a nearly equally interesting object of study as a philosopher, philologist, or exegetical scholar.

H. D.

---

#### ART. V.—THE CHRISTIAN REVIEW ON ORIGINAL SIN.\*

THE January number of the Christian Review contains an able leading article on the subject of Original Sin. This article takes strong Calvinistic ground, maintaining the thesis that "Sin is a Nature, and that Nature Guilt." But it has the high merit of being addressed to the understanding and reason. It is perfectly intelligible in its statements, and perfectly rational in its method of proof. We may see much reason to regard its proofs as insufficient, and to reject its positions as untenable; but we cannot complain of confusion of thought, or of any of those rhetorical or logical sophisms by which a subject is darkened rather than elucidated, and minds are mystified rather than convinced. It is joy to meet an antagonist who knows exactly what he means to say, and scorns to use arguments not wholly convincing to his own mind. This writer speaks because he believes,—not merely because he wishes to make others believe what he thinks ought to be believed. When the ancient positions in theology are defended anew by arguments of this tone and character, it seems proper for the organs of liberal theology to give such arguments attentive and candid consideration. This we now propose to do; as

---

\* *The Christian Review.* Jan., 1852. Vol. XVII. No. LXVII. Rev. SEWALL S. CUTTING, Editor, &c. Art. I. *The Doctrine of Original Sin. Sin a Nature, and that Nature Guilt.*

suming the attitude, not merely of antagonists, but of learners; and proposing, not merely to point out the weak points and the open places of the argument, but to enrich ourselves and our readers by such new insight into a difficult subject as our contemporary may be able to give us.

After some introductory remarks, which it is not necessary to notice, the Reviewer lays down his first position, that Sin is a Nature. His statement is, that we all sin necessarily and continually in consequence of *our nature*; i. e. the character born with us, original and innate.

The proofs of this position are,—1. The language of St. Paul (Eph. ii. 3), “We were by nature the children of wrath, even as others.” 2. That we are compelled by the laws of our mind to refer volitions to a nature, as qualities to a substance. We cannot stop in the outward act of sin, but by a mental instinct look inward to the particular volition from which the sin came. Nor can the mind stop with this particular volition. There is a steady and uniform state of character, which particular volitions cannot explain. The instinct of reason causes us to look back for one common principle and source, which shall give unity to the subject; and having attained a view both central and simple, it is satisfied. As our mind compels us to refer all properties to a substance in which they inhere, so it compels us to refer all similar volitions to a simple nature. When we see exercises of the soul, we as instinctively refer them to a nature in that soul, as we refer the properties of a body to the substance of that body. 3. Christian experience proves that Sin is a Nature. The Christian, especially as his experience deepens, is troubled, not so much by his separate sinful actions and volitions, as by the sinful nature which they indicate, and out of which they spring. We are compelled to believe, as we look inward, that there is a principle of evil within us, below those separate transgressions of which we are conscious. There is a diseased condition of the soul, which these transgressions indicate. There are secret faults from which we pray to be cleansed. 4. The history of Christian doctrine shows that the Church has in all ages believed in a sinful nature, as distinguished from conscious transgressions.

These are the proofs of the first position, that Sin is a

Nature. We have stated them concisely, but with sufficient distinctness and completeness. Let us now examine their validity.

1. The first argument is the text in Ephesians, "We were by nature children of wrath," ἡμεν τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς. The word *φύσις*, the Reviewer contends, "always denotes something original and innate, in contradistinction to something acquired by practice or habit." This text, we know, is the proof-text of Original Sin; and is considered by many commentators as teaching that man's nature is wholly corrupt. But plainly this is going too far. Granting the full meaning claimed for the word *φύσις*, the text only asserts that there is something in man's nature which exposes him to the Divine displeasure by being the source of sin. It does not assert the corruption of the whole nature, nor preclude the supposition that we are born with tendencies to good, no less than to evil. That we are so, the Reviewer is bound by his own statement to admit: for if this Greek word "always denotes something original and innate," it denotes this in Romans ii. 14,\* which declares that the Gentiles "do by nature the things contained in the law." According to this passage in Romans, if there be such a thing as Natural Depravity, it is not total; and if there be such a thing as Total Depravity, it is not natural. Those who wish to maintain both doctrines can only do it by admitting two different kinds of sinfulness in man, one of which is natural, but not total; the other total, but not natural; — a distinction which we esteem a sound one. According to this passage (in Romans ii. 14), we must understand *φύσις* as referring to the good side of man's nature, and the same word in Eph. ii. 3 as referring to the corrupt side of man's moral nature. The first refers to the "law of the mind"; the second, to the other "law in the members" (Rom. vii. 23). But there is another passage (Gal. ii. 15), which asserts that the

---

\* The *nature* by which the heathen "do the things contained in the law," i. e. obey God, which is here (Rom. ii. 15) called "the law written in the heart," is in Rom. vii. 23 called "the law of the mind." Olshausen (a sufficiently orthodox commentator) says, "It is wholly false to understand ὅταν ποιῶν of a mere ideal *possibility*; the Apostle speaks evidently of a real and actual obedience. Paul infers, that, because there are actually pious heathen, they must have a law which they obey." *Ad locum.*

Jews by nature are not sinners, like the heathen. Now, as we can hardly suppose that the original instincts and innate tendencies of the Jewish child were radically good from birth, and essentially different from those of the heathen, and as such a supposition would contradict the whole argument of Paul in Romans ii., it is evident that *φύσις* in Galatians ii. 15 does not denote something original and innate. The meaning of this verse probably is, that the Jew from birth up, and by the mere fact of being born a Jew, came under the influences of a religious education, which preserved him from many forms of heathen depravity. The word, therefore, means in that passage, not a Jew by nature, but a Jew by birth; and if so, we are at liberty, if we choose, to ascribe the same meaning to the word in Ephesians, and to understand the text to teach that we were by birth placed under circumstances which tended necessarily to deprave the character.

This passage, therefore, quoted by the Reviewer, does not teach entire depravity by nature, but a partial depravity, either found in the hereditary tendencies and instincts, or acquired by means of the evil circumstances surrounding the child from his birth.

2. The second argument of the Reviewer is, that the laws of mind compel us to refer sinful volitions to a sinful nature, as they compel us to refer qualities to a substance.

We answer, that, where we see uniform and constant habits of action, we are compelled to refer these to a permanent character or state of being. If a man once in his life becomes intoxicated, we do not infer any habit of intemperance, or any vicious tendency; but if he is habitually intemperate, we are compelled, as the Reviewer justly asserts, to look beneath the separate single actions for one common principle and source. But in assuming that this source is a nature brought with us into the world, the Reviewer seems to us to jump to a conclusion. It may be an acquired character, not an original nature. It may be an induced state of disease either of body or mind, a depravity which has commenced this side of childhood. We know that there are acquired habits both of mind and of body; otherwise, not only would it be impossible for a man to grow worse, but it would also be impossible for him to grow better, and there

would be an end to all improvement and progress. Such an acquired character introduces unity into the subject of investigation, as completely as does an original nature; and therefore satisfies all the wants of the mind.

3. A precisely similar answer may be made to the Reviewer's third argument, drawn from Christian experience. He is perfectly right, we think, in saying that the Christian is troubled, not merely, nor chiefly, by the recollection of single acts and volitions of evil, but in the evidence which they seem to give of a sinful state of mind and heart. He is right in considering any theory of Moral Evil shallow and inadequate which only takes into account sinful actions and sinful volitions. What earnest man, who has seriously set about correcting a fault, or improving his character, but has been obliged to say, "To will is present with me; but how to perform that which I will, I find not"? Every earnest effort shows us more plainly how deep the roots of evil run below the surface. We find a *law* in the members warring against the law of the mind, and bringing us into captivity to the law of sin. This is the description which Paul gives of it. It is a *law*; that is, something regular, constant, permanent,—a steady stress, a bias toward evil. The Apostle, however, differs from the Reviewer in placing this law, not in the will, but in the members: and also in stating that there is another law, that of the mind, which has a tendency toward good. In the unregenerate we understand him to teach that the law of evil is the stronger, and holds the man, the personal will, captive. In the regenerate, the reverse is the case. Nor does Paul teach that this sinful tendency is guilt. It is not "*O guilty man that I am!*" but "*O wretched man that I am!*"

Now, while we agree with the Reviewer in rejecting as superficial and inadequate any theory of Evil, whether emanating from our own denomination or from any other, which does not recognize this evil state or tendency lying below the volitions, we differ from him in that we think it not always a nature, but a character. He has not proved, nor begun to prove, that this dark ground of evil in man is always innate or original. It may or may not be; but the argument from Christian experience shows nothing of the sort.

4. The Reviewer's fourth and remaining argument is, that the Church has, in all ages, believed in a sinful nature as distinguished from conscious transgressions. If this were so, we admit that it should have weight in the inquiry; but we deny the fact so far, at least, as the sinful nature is concerned, and may give reasons hereafter for this opinion.\*

The Reviewer proceeds thus: "Assuming, then, that the fact of a sinful nature has been established, we pass to the second statement of St. Paul, that man is by nature a child of wrath. We pass from his statement that Sin, in its ultimate form, is a Nature, to his statement that this Nature is Guilt." If we have done justice to the Reviewer's arguments,—and it has been our object to state them fairly, though briefly,—we submit that the fact of a sinful nature has not been established by them. He has shown that in man there is a tendency to evil running below the conscious, distinct volitions,—that there is a permanent character, good or evil, which manifests itself and becomes first apparent to ourselves, or to others, in these separate, spiritual exercises or actions. But that this stress either to good or evil, this law either of the mind or members, is original and inborn is yet to be proved. Let us then consider the second point, namely, whether this character or nature, whichever it may be, is also Guilt.

1. As the Reviewer's first argument to prove a sinful nature was drawn from the Greek word *φύσις*, so his first argument to prove that Nature Guilt is derived from the Greek word *όργη* in the same passage. "The Apostle teaches," he says, "that sinful man is a child of wrath.

---

\* We have no room to enter into an examination of this question at this time, and can only give a general statement on this subject from one of the authorities which happens to be at hand:—

"All the Fathers" (before Augustine, fourth and fifth century) "differed from Augustine, in attributing freedom of will to man in his present state. Thus Justin: 'Every created being is so constituted as to be capable of vice or virtue.' Cyril of Jerusalem: 'Know that thou hast a soul possessed of free will; for thou dost not sin by birth (*κατὰ γένεσιν*), nor by fortune, but we sin by free choice.' All the Latin Fathers also maintained that free will was *not* lost after the Fall. The Fathers also denied in part, that man is born infected with Adam's sin. Thus Athenagoras says in his *Apology*: 'Man is in a good state, not only in respect to his Creator, but also in respect to his natural generation.'" — Wiggins, *Augustinianism and Pelagianism*. Translated by Rev. Ralph Emerson, Professor in the Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass.

Now none but a guilty being can be the object of the righteous and holy displeasure of God." But this word, translated *wrath*, is confessedly used in other senses beside that of the Divine anger or displeasure. It may mean the sufferings or punishments which come as the result of sin, in which sense it is used in Matt. iii. 7, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" and other places. This word is used in the passage just quoted for some future evil; in John iii. 36, for a present evil,— "The wrath of God abides on him"; and in 1 Thess. ii. 16, for a past evil,— "For the wrath is come [lit. *has* come] on them to the uttermost." It may mean the subjective feeling of guilt; the sense that we deserve the Divine displeasure, which is removed by the assurance of forgiveness. It may mean the state of alienation from God, which results by a law of the conscience from this sense of guilt,— an alienation removed by the Divine act by which God reconciles the sinner to himself. And the radical meaning, from which these secondary meanings flow, may be the essential antagonism existing between the holy nature of God and all evil. But whatever it means, it cannot intend any thing like human anger. In the Divine wrath there is neither selfishness nor passion; and it must consist with an infinite love towards its object. The word, therefore, as used in Eph. ii. 3, does not convey the idea of guilt, *a vi terminis*. It may mean as well, that this sinful tendency in man, manifesting itself in sinful actions, produces a state of estrangement or alienation between man and God. How far this is a guilty alienation, and how far it is evil and sorrowful, is not to be learned from the term itself.

2. But the main proof of the Reviewer in support of his second position is found in the assertion, that this sinful tendency in man, out of which evil acts continually flow, is not a tendency of the physical nature, but of the will itself. He distinguishes the will proper from the mere faculty of single choices, and considers it to be a deeper power lying at the very centre of the soul, which determines the whole man with reference to some great and ultimate end of living. It is, in fact, the man himself,— the person. For man, he asserts, is not essentially intellect or feeling; but is essentially and at bottom

a Will, a self-determining creature. "His other faculties of knowing and feeling are grafted into this stock and root; and hence he is responsible from centre to circumference." He then affirms the Will, thus defined, to be the responsible and guilty author of the sinful Nature; being nothing more nor less than its constant and total determination to self as the ultimate end of living. This voluntary power, which is the man himself, has turned away from God and directed itself to self as an ultimate end; and this state of the Will is the sinful Nature of man.

We have no disposition to quarrel with the psychology of this statement. We admit man to be essentially Will, in the sense here described. He is essentially Activity; an activity limited externally, by special organization and circumstances,—limited internally, by quantity of force, and knowledge.

Nor, again, do we deny that in the unregenerate state the will of man is directed to self rather than to God as its ultimate end; and that this is guilt, and in a certain sense total guilt. No man can serve two masters. If he is obedient to one, he is necessarily disobedient to the other. This disobedience may, or may not, appear in act; but it is there in state. He whose ultimate end is self-gratification is always ready to sacrifice the will of God to his own. He whose ultimate end is God is always ready to sacrifice his own will. In this sense, the unregenerate man may be said to be wholly sinful; and he who is born of God, not to commit sin.

Thus much we grant; and the admission is a large one. But we must now object to the Reviewer, that this is but one side of the question; and that he has omitted to see the other side. The sources of evil are not so simple as he seems to suppose; for man is a very complex being, and the world in which he lives is a very complex world. We therefore would inquire,—

What proof have we that this guilty direction of the Will is a *Nature*, in the sense claimed; i. e. something innate or original? Why may not the Will have been turned gradually in this direction as we grow up, by enticements of pleasure; and why might not the Will, in like manner, by means of wise culture, have been gradually directed to God?

Again, what proof have we that we are so wholly *unconscious* of this direction of the Will, as our author contends? That a great many of the acts of the Will are unconscious acts, like the separate movements of the finger in a skilful pianist, or lifting of the feet in walking, we admit; and we are not responsible for these separate acts, but for the *preceding choice*, by means of which we determine to play the tune, or walk the mile. In like manner, the direction of the soul to self rather than to God may be moral evil; but is not moral guilt, until we become conscious of it, in a greater or less degree. Then, when partially or wholly awakened to the evil direction of the soul, if we allow ourselves to neglect this discovery, to turn away from the fact and forget it, on that conscious act presses the whole burden of guilt, and not on the unconscious volitions which may result from it. We say, therefore, in opposition to the Reviewer, that though there may be depravity without consciousness of the depraved state, there cannot be guilt without consciousness of the evil choice, or, as the Apostle says, "Sin is not imputed where there is no law."

Again, we totally dissent from the statement that this deep-lying will in man is unable to obey the commands, "Turn ye, turn ye, from your evil way, for why will ye die," — "Repent and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out," — "Make you a new heart and a new spirit," — "Choose you this day whom you will serve," — "Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and be saved." The Reviewer says, that "such a power as this, including so much, and running so deep, which is a determination of the whole soul, cannot, from the very nature of the case, be such a facile and easily managed power as that by which we resolve to do some particular thing in every-day life." True: not *so* easily managed; but can it not be *managed at all*? It may require *more* self-examination to understand what the direction of the Will is, and more concentration of thought and will, and more leaning on God's help; but *with* all these are we able or not able to turn to God? He says, the great main tendency of the Will to self and sin as an ultimate end, though having a free and criminal origin, "is not to be reversed so easily." True, again; but why not *less* easily? The Reviewer speaks of the sinful Will as a

"total determination of itself to self"; and asks "how the power that is to reverse all this process can possibly come out of the Will thus shut up, and entirely swallowed in the process. How is the process to destroy itself?" But what! Has man become *a process*? He is essentially Will, but is this Will blind mechanism? Has it not, according to our author's own theory, intelligence, conscience, affection, rooted into it? The moment that the Reviewer begins to speak of the Will, as unable to change its direction, he is compelled to conceive of it materially and mechanically, and not as the moral, responsible soul. He says, "The human Will becomes a current that becomes unmanageable, simply because of its own momentum." And therefore, again, he is obliged to conceive of the whole voluntary power as lost; and lost before man was born; and he reduces all our real freedom to the original act of the Will previous to birth, which took place when we were present in Adam's soul, and committed the first transgression with him.

This is plainly the denial of all human freedom since the fall of Adam. We bring into the world, according to the Reviewer, a Will wholly and inevitably bent to evil. We have no consciousness of this tendency, and if we were conscious of it we have no power to change it; but we yet are responsible for it, and guilty because of it, inasmuch as we began this state ourselves when all our souls were mystically present in the soul of Adam. Of this theory, we merely say now, that, if it be true, man is not *now* guilty of any sin which he commits in his mortal life; for he is not now a free being. He is only responsible for the sin which he freely committed in Adam. He is no more responsible when we suppose his sin to proceed from his will, than when we suppose it to proceed from a depraved sensuous nature, or from involuntary ignorance, for he is no more free in the one case than in the other. He may be an infinitely depraved and infinitely miserable being, but he can in no true sense be called a *guilty* being. Again we say, if this theory be true, it is an awful theory; and one which we cannot possibly reconcile with the justice or goodness, and still less with the fatherly character, of God. That God should so have constituted human nature that

all the millions of the human race should have had this fatal opportunity of destroying themselves utterly, by one simultaneous act, in Adam, is, to say the least, an *awful* theory to propound concerning our Heavenly Father. We might put Christ's argument to any man not hardened by theological study, as it seems to us, with irresistible force. "What man is there among *you*, BEING A FATHER," who could do any thing of this sort. But we know too well that all such appeals fall harmless from the sevenfold shield of a systematized theology.

Therefore, we will only say further, concerning this theory, that, as being *apparently* in direct conflict with the Divine attributes as taught in the New Testament; as making man a mere process deprived of real freedom; as proving man not guilty for any sin committed in this life; and as thereby deadening the sense of responsibility and showing that we cannot possibly obey the command, "Repent and turn to God,"—this theory of a sin committed in Adam *ought to have the amplest proof* before we believe it. We admit that it may be true, though opposed to all our ideas of God, man, and duty. But being thus opposed, it ought to be sustained by the most unanswerable arguments. If Jesus and his Apostles have told us so plainly, we must believe it if we can. How is it, then. Not a word on the subject in the four Gospels. Not a text from the lips of Jesus which can be pretended to lay down any such theory. He does not even mention the name of Adam once in the Gospels, nor allude to him except when speaking of marriage. This theory rests, not on any thing contained in the Gospels, Book of Acts, or Epistles of Peter, James, or John; but on two texts in two Epistles of Paul (Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 22). In the latter passage Paul says not a word of Adam's sin, but only of his death,—the whole chapter treating, not of sin, but of death and the resurrection. This passage, therefore, can hardly be considered a plain statement of the theory. The other, in Romans, is confessedly so far from plain, that it is difficult to make it agree with any theory; but the most evident meaning, to one who has no theory to support, is, that sin began with Adam, and the consequences of sin, which are moral and physical evil, began also with him; and as he thus set in motion a series of evil ten-

cies which we find in our organization, and which Paul elsewhere calls the law of the members, and a series of evil circumstances which we find around us in the world, both of which are the occasion of sin, we may trace back to him the commencement of human disobedience. If the passage teaches any thing more than this, it certainly does not teach it plainly or explicitly.

We have thus briefly examined the Reviewer's doctrine that "Sin is a Nature, and that Nature Guilt"; and have given a few, but, as it seems to us, sufficient reasons, for rejecting it. There is a strong antecedent improbability resting against it from the attributes of the Deity. It contradicts primal convictions of the human reason, which assert human freedom and a present responsibility inseparably connected with it. And it rests on no plain or adequate basis of Scripture declaration. Yet, in rejecting it, we are obliged to ask, Why is it that earnest thinkers and Christians, like our Reviewer, should be moved to assert such an argument? What is the motive which leads men, good and thinking men, to believe in Original Sin and Total Depravity? We cannot set aside this question, if we desire to make any real progress in this theological inquiry. Some truths, some facts, something real and important, must lie behind these doctrines and be involved in them, or they could not have been believed so widely and defended so ardently. Connected with the formal error, there must be some substantial truth. And the law of human progress requires that, for the overthrow of any false system or evil institution, the truth and the good involved in it shall be first recognized, extricated, and accepted. Then the remainder of error will fall of itself. Here, it seems to us, is one of the directions in which discussion may be most profitably carried on between sincere believers in doctrines seemingly irreconcilable.

This question we may attempt to answer, therefore, on another occasion.

J. F. C.

## ART. VI.—THOMAS HOPKINS GALLAUDET.\*

WE are glad of an opportunity of placing upon record in our journal a name second to no other in the annals of unostentatious and successful benevolence,—we mean the name of THOMAS HOPKINS GALLAUDET. We welcome the tribute to his memory in the form of the comely volume whose title is given below. There could have been found no worthier eulogist of the departed philanthropist than Mr. Barnard, whose sympathies and abilities have, for many years, been given to the cause of popular education, and whose intimacy with Mr. Gallaudet opened to him the treasures of understanding and heart which his "Tribute" spreads before the world.

The eulogy is earnest, tender, and appreciative, but is in no wise exaggerated. On the contrary, it under-colors, if any thing, the extraordinary excellences of its subject. Its quiet flow is in keeping with the gentle character whose qualities it delineates. It is a model of performances of its kind.

Mr. Gallaudet's name is the nucleus of all historic accretions on the subject of deaf-mute instruction in this country. And this is made to appear in the volume under review. The Appendix is exceedingly valuable, containing, as it does, a complete, though succinct, history of the origin and growth of deaf-mute institutions in Europe and in the United States, with collateral and illustrative matters of no inferior interest.

We hope the book may find an extensive circulation; and more especially, because the net profits from its sale are for the benefit of her † in whose name the copyright stands.

We propose to give a brief sketch of the life of the subject of this article, and to append some remarks upon two or three of his prominent characteristics.

Mr. Gallaudet was born in the city of Philadelphia, on

\* *Tribute to Gallaudet. A Discourse in Commemoration of the Life, Character, and Services of the REV. THOMAS H. GALLAUDET, LL. D., delivered before the Citizens of Hartford, January 7, 1852. With an Appendix, containing a History of Deaf-Mute Instruction and Institutions, and other Documents.* By HENRY BARNARD. Hartford: Published by Brockett & Hutchinson. 1852. 12mo. pp. 263.

† The deaf and dumb widow, Mrs. Sophia Fowler Gallaudet.

the 10th of December, 1787, of Huguenot and Puritan parentage. The family removed to Hartford, in Connecticut, in 1800. Mr. Gallaudet was graduated at Yale College in 1805. Here he gave evidence of those moral and intellectual qualities which so marked his after career. He was genial in temperament, scrupulously punctual and accurate in his college exercises, and especially proficient in mathematics and English composition. After leaving college he entered a law office in Hartford; but his delicate health obliged him to relinquish his legal studies. Afterwards, he was for a while tutor in Yale College; but his failing health again compelled him to a less sedentary employment, and he undertook a business commission, which gave him the advantages of exercise, open air, and travelling. Subsequently, he entered, as clerk, a counting-room in the city of New York. But no one of these vocations was precisely to his taste, although in any of them he could not but have been distinguished.

In the autumn of 1811, he commenced the study of theology at Andover; and after the usual course of preparation, broken and obstructed by indisposition, he was licensed to preach. In the pulpit, he was eminently successful. His meek, earnest, and devout manner, the simplicity and fervor of his prayers, his clear, admirably worded, practical discourses, and his voice, persuasive without being musical, brought his services at once into high estimation and general demand.

It would seem as if the pastoral vocation was that of all others suited to his powers and character; for with the gifts above specified he united in a singular degree that quickness of sympathy and tenderness of manner, so rarely met with, yet which are indispensable to the power of personal intercourse in the ministerial profession. But Providence designed another field for him.

His acquaintance with "little Alice Cogswell," a deaf mute, daughter of a distinguished physician in Hartford, aroused his interest in a class of unfortunates, for whose education in this country no provision had ever been, or seemed likely to be, made. His singular talent in imparting knowledge to her secluded mind, and in unfolding her faculties, induced her father to relinquish his idea of sending his child abroad for instruction, and to con-

sider whether a school for deaf mutes might not be established nearer home.

The subject met favor with the wealthy and philanthropic merchants of Hartford. It was determined to send a suitable person to Europe, to learn the methods of deaf-mute instruction, preparatory to the establishment of a school in this country. Mr. Gallaudet was by common consent appointed to this mission.

On the 20th of May, 1835, he sailed for England. The history of his unsuccessful efforts to obtain admission into either the London or the Edinburgh institution, as a pupil, is exceedingly interesting. The beneficent art of deaf-mute teaching seems then to have been regarded as special property. Its promiscuous diffusion was guarded by personal jealousy and private interest. Bonds had been given, in heavy sums, that the magic secret should not go beyond its first recipients. So Mr. Gallaudet was obliged to turn elsewhere for light. Fortunately, French benevolence was not so restricted. The Abbé Sicard, who happened to be in London at this time, lecturing on the methods of deaf-mute instruction, received Mr. Gallaudet cordially; invited him to visit Paris, and avail himself, without fee, of the advantages of the deaf-mute school in that city.

After a short stay in Paris, Mr. Gallaudet returned to this country, bringing with him Mr. Laurent Clerc, one of the Abbé Sicard's most distinguished pupils; who was associated with Mr. Gallaudet in the labors of deaf-mute instruction in the "American Asylum," and who is now one of the most valuable of its excellent corps of teachers.

Some two years were spent after Mr. Gallaudet's return, in obtaining subscriptions and maturing preparations for the permanent establishment of an American Institution for the Instruction of the Deaf and Dumb. On Wednesday, the 15th of April, 1817, the Asylum was opened with a class of seven pupils; and on the Sunday evening following, Mr. Gallaudet delivered a discourse in the Centre Congregational Church, from the words of Isaiah, "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb sing, for in the wilderness waters shall break out, and streams in the desert."

Concerning this discourse, Mr. Barnard says, beautifully : —

“ On rising from a fresh perusal of this admirable discourse, written in such pure, polished, and idiomatic English, and breathing so much of the spirit of Him, by whose miraculous agency the ears of the deaf were opened and the tongue of the dumb loosened ; and contrasting that group of seven pupils, ignorant, isolated, and unhappy, and the moral desert in which the deaf and dumb then dwelt, with the thousands of the same class who have since been cheered and blessed, and all the good, direct and indirect, to the cause of Christian philanthropy, which has flowed out of these small beginnings, — we seem almost to stand at the well-spring of that river of life, seen in the vision of the prophet, which, flowing out from beneath the sanctuary and on the right hand of the altar into the wilderness, a little rill that could be stepped over, widened and deepened in its progress, till it became a mighty stream, — a stream which could not be passed, imparting life wherever it came, and nourishing all along its banks trees, whose fruit was for meat, and whose leaves for medicine.”

Mr. Gallaudet remained Principal of the Asylum until 1830, when, on account of infirm health, he resigned his position. With respect to his agency in the establishment of this most successful and beneficent institution, his eulogist says : “ It is instinctively and universally felt that the directing mind in this great enterprise, in its inception, its gradual maturing, and ultimate organization, was that of Thomas Hopkins Gallaudet.” In testimony of his success in this important position, we need only refer to the unstinted approbation of the Directors of the institution, and of the whole community, and to the grateful regard of successive classes of pupils.

After Mr. Gallaudet’s resignation, he employed himself for some years in the preparation of books for children, in which department of most useful labor we think he has never been excelled, if equalled. He did not make books *to sell*. He did not re-shape and re-name other men’s ideas, but he drew his pages from his own stores of observation and of thinking. He had a practical reason for the views, methods, and suggestions which he urged upon his readers. His ruling motive in publishing was the benefit of others.

On the 6th of June, 1836, Mr. Gallaudet accepted the

appointment of chaplain in the Connecticut Retreat for the Insane. It is not easy to find one in all respects competent to discharge the delicate duties of such a position. But Mr. Gallaudet was fully equal to its requirements. He won the unreserved confidence and the entire affection of the patients in the institution. His tact was inexhaustible. His patience was never wearied. His tenderness never lapsed. His conscientiousness was distinct and controlling through all and to the end.

Mr. Gallaudet remained connected with the "Retreat" until his death, on the 10th of September, 1851, when, after a wearisome sickness of forty-six days, during most of which time his mind was remarkably clear and active, "his spirit passed away so gently that the precise moment was unmarked."

"They thought him dying when he slept,  
And sleeping when he died."

There are two or three points of Mr. Gallaudet's character on which we cannot forbear dwelling awhile; and as the first, because at the root of his varied excellence, we mention his *religious faith*.

There are those, doubtless, to whom this phrase brings only vague images, and intimates most uncertain results. But not if the thing it signifies were a solid substance before the eye, or a ball of lead within the hand, could it be a more palpable reality than as it appeared in Mr. Gallaudet's character. It was the pulsation of his heart. It was the inspiration of his life. We have never known one who cast himself with a more grateful and joyous trust into a reliance on the Creator's will. Among the manifest facts of his daily experience, which shaped his judgment, affected his sensibilities, determined his conduct, the fact of an overruling Providence was real and decisive; not theoretically established, but instinctively felt. His doctrinal opinions were orthodox, and not only this, but thoroughly and rigidly orthodox; of a stamp too inflexible, perhaps, for the full approval of what is sometimes called the New England school of Evangelicalism. Yet strange to say, this strict theology was, in Mr. Gallaudet, divorced from almost, if not quite, all those accompaniments so repulsive to minds and hearts trained under a more liberal system of Scripture interpretation.

We have said, this is strange; for, in the instance of our revered friend, his doctrinal views were not loosely held, or lightly prized, or believed to be other than vitally operative. He never said, and he never felt, that it is no matter what a man believes, provided he is sincere,—that common cant of spurious liberalism. So that the unwrinkled beauty, the unembittered sweetness, of his Christian character and affections, are not due to the fact that he was indifferent to the “saving doctrines” of the Gospel. But are we not justified in applying the word “strange” to this phenomenon of Christian gentleness and toleration, when it is so common to find those who stand professionally on that theological platform imperious in their assertions, grudging in their admissions to an antagonist, denunciatory in their doctrinal expositions, supercilious in demeanor, and socially exclusive toward those whom they consider in error,—at all events, ungenial and unbrotherly at heart, with whomever they suspect of “heresy” or latitudinarianism? None of this had Mr. Gallaudet. Allowing, of course, for the freer flow of his sympathies in some directions than in others, he always showed entire respect toward men of all varieties of religious belief; extended to them unvarying personal kindness, did not withhold from them domestic hospitalities, and was always more than willing to co-operate with them in all efforts in the service of humanity and for the public good.

The secret of this catholic spirit in one whose theological creed so frequently engenders narrowness was precisely here. Mr. Gallaudet’s religion lay not in the forms of his faith, but below them. They constituted the *espalier* upon which his devout instincts climbed upward; but the root of his religion lay in the soul, not the intellect, and its nourishment came not from the artificial trellis-work of church decrees, but from the soil of New Testament truth. “By their fruits shall ye know them,” was a favorite text with him, and it furnished the canon by which he estimated personal worth and the value of private belief.

Mr. Gallaudet, in preaching, in conversation, and in practice, set forth a doctrine that has always been cardinal among Liberal Christians; namely, the indispensableness of personal righteousness. He, indeed, made

prominent the necessity of faith in the atoning sacrifice of the Saviour; but the latter without the former was a whitewashed sepulchre. He countenanced no theory of salvation by faith alone. The practical direction of his religion is well expressed by one who knew him intimately for the last twenty years of his life.

" His religion was beneficence, where good was to be done or kindness shown. It was honesty, exact and scrupulous, where business was to be transacted between him and his fellow-men. It was conscientiousness, where the rights of others were involved in his plans or his acts. It was self-denial, where the wants of the poor and the unfortunate required not only an outlay of time, but solicitations sometimes painful to make, in gaining the coöperation of others. It was courtesy, where it was often difficult to reconcile the claims of an extensive acquaintance with the discharge of pressing, indispensable engagements. It was humility towards God, showing itself in a deep sense of unworthiness. It was penitence, when human weakness yielded to temptation,— penitence sincere, abiding, and fruitful in meet works. It was cordial trust in the atonement of a Divine Redeemer,— not leading to carelessness, but exciting prayerful efforts to transfer the grace of that Redeemer's character to his own." — p. 46.

Another feature of Mr. Gallaudet's character, and one which requires to be distinctly set forth, was his *benevolence*. If the history of much of the nominally benevolent action and public service of men were read in the light of the Divine judgment, we fear that a sad adulteration of reputedly Christian motives would appear. If, among the mainsprings of our nature, that coil, a desire of human applause, a regard for the estimation of the world, should lose its temper and exert no further force upon individual effort, what a prodigious collapse would there be in services for private or public good! If the hope of pecuniary recompense were stricken from among the inducements to philanthropic action, how many *humane* efforts would be abandoned! If there were no such operative sentiment as a desire to "be somebody," in some sort of work, or to find scope for one's energies in a sphere not repugnant to one's kindly impulses and not over-crowded with competitors, the field of benevolent action would be still further and materially abridged.

We would not judge too unfavorably of human nature; but we believe that the secret consciousness of our readers will admit the truth of our positions. We conceive, however, that Mr. Gallaudet's benevolence (if of any human quality so strong an assertion may be ventured) would stand the test of the light of the Divine judgment. To the extent to which this beautiful sentiment may become perfect in man, we think it was perfect in him. Self-forgetfulness and self-sacrifice can have no other avenue than pure benevolence; and we have yet to learn of the first act of nominal disinterestedness on the part of Mr. Gallaudet, in which the looking toward selfish gain is suspected to have had place. In illustration at once of his piety, his humility, and his unselfish aspirations, we subjoin an extract from his journal, which appears as a prayer.

"I beseech God to guard me against all concern,—(1st.) About my own temporal concerns. O, may I be led to take no thought, in this respect, for the morrow, but to leave God to furnish me with what temporal comforts he may see best for me, and not ever form my plans for pecuniary emolument. (2dly.) Against all undue anxiety respecting the management of the Asylum by its directors. O, may I have a meek, quiet, uncomplaining spirit, with regard to all that they may do, however unwise it may seem to be, according to my poor, weak, fallible judgment. May I strive, each day, to do all the good I can to the souls of my dear pupils, and calmly resign every thing which lies out of my own immediate sphere of duty into the hand of Him who will overrule all things, however adverse they may seem, for his own glory. (3dly.) Against all uncharitable feelings against any who are associated with me in the internal management of the Asylum. May I rather be careful to examine my own heart and conduct, and consider how far shall I fail of doing my duty conscientiously and zealously. (4thly.) Against any regard to public opinion, while I have the approbation of my own conscience. (5thly.) Against the corruption of my own heart and my daily besetting sins." — p. 23.

"I presume it is safe to say," remarks his eulogist, "that Mr. Gallaudet never rose in the morning without having in his mind, or on his hands, some extra duty of philanthropy to perform,—something beyond what was attached to him, from his official or regular engagements."

Necessarily, the directions of the benevolence of a man

so sagacious and so experienced as Mr. Gallaudet were manifold, and the occasions of its exercise were constant. The great work of popular education enlisted all his sympathies and the aid of all his powers. With the author of the "Theory of Human Progression," he believed that "knowledge," including, of course, moral and religious knowledge, "is the only means given to man to evolve correct action, and that correct action is the only means whereby man can evolve a correct, and consequently beneficial condition." Normal schools engaged his early and constant attention. Home training, alleviation of the condition of the insane, lyceums and institutes for young men, female seminaries, religious instruction of the West, peace, African colonization, treatment of criminals, were subjects on which he wrote, counselled, and labored with effect. In short, there was no subject of valuable reform to which he did not direct his mind, and on which he did not shed light. He was not, in the strict sense of the word, a reformer. But if he lacked the reformer's aggressive energy, he possessed the wisdom and the flexibility of method and the true heart of philanthropy, without which the work of reformation comes nearer being the tornado of passion than the purifying breeze of humane endeavor.

In an unnoticed way, Mr. Gallaudet dispensed constant and invaluable charities; those that show most effectually the undying root of genuine benevolence. He visited in person the poor and the suffering. He sat by the bedsides of the sick and dying; and this not in a parish, by contract, not in the routine of paid duty, but as called by the necessities of his fellow-creatures. One said truly of him, that "he could not walk the length of Main Street without doing some good, by word or act, to some being, young or old." In fine, Mr. Gallaudet's benevolence was a quality never to be put on or taken off, for it was of the man; or rather, the man was of it.

We cannot but feel, if our estimate thus far of the character of this remarkable person be true, that in him the spirit of the two commandments, on which Christ hung "all the law and the prophets," found a beautiful realization.

We suppose the world would withhold from the sub-

ject of these remarks the position and repute of a "great man." Yet to be classed with Oberlin, and Vincent de Paul, and Clarkson, and Howard, and Tuckerman, is a distinction of which few certainly are worthy. In that company, however, is Mr. Gallaudet's place. In certain qualities of intellect he had no superior. His judgment in practical affairs possessed the accuracy of almost supernatural insight. When he had once investigated a subject of this character, little more remained to be discovered on the same side. This sagacity was the result of his candor, which enabled him to do justice to the objector's position; of his fidelity, which permitted him to slight no work when once before him to be done; of his power of continuous attention, which precluded the possibility of any part of the subject, whether in its present relations or its probable issues, eluding his scrutiny; and of his habit of applying to his examinations the systematized fruits of his experience. We regard his style in writing as almost faultless. It possessed the high charm of showing itself the instrument of truth, not of him who held the pen. What he wrote answered its end, in arresting attention and producing conviction.

Mr. Gallaudet has gone to his reward. The rich and the poor mourned his departure. All sects rendered to his mortal remains the tribute of their grief, and to his memory they render the tribute of their reverence.

J. H.

---

#### ART. VII.—MAN AND NATURE.

As the modern chemist claims that all things become identical so soon as they enter his crucible, so there is no distinction possible in language over which the metaphysicians will not shake their heads in suspicion. Man, they hint, is a part of Nature; and Nature is obviously a part of Man. Leaving to them this valuable discovery, we pass to the truth at all events obvious, that Man and Nature comprise for us the apparent universe. Deity we recognize as the source of this vast and varied con-

sequence, the centre of the circle whose divided arcs we measure ; but all revelation of him must confessedly come through either a natural or a human medium, — a higher or lower incarnation. We look through nature up to nature's God, or we have the life of God in the soul of man ; it must be the one or the other.

We are born into the world. For a few days and weeks we are to ourselves the sole fact of the universe, save the sweet bosom from which we are scarcely yet individualized. But presently our eyes are unsealed, the mists are dissipated which veiled our dawn, and a crowded world of other existences swiftly and more swiftly bursts forth upon us. We are but one fact in a countless accumulation of facts on every side. Air, water, earth, flowers, stars, beasts, mountains, — beautiful puzzles, delicious wonders, — are around us. A web of wonder arches, blue and gold, above our heads ; wonder envelops us, white and gray, in the atmosphere ; wonder ripples, blue and sparkling, before us. We stamp our feet ; we know not on what they tread, — a thin shell whose substance whirls over and over in the air, bearing us with it through realms unknown. Animal nature moves in its mystery around us, walks the earth, four-footed, six-footed, hairy, smooth, many-colored, with strange, silent eyes yet unexplored ; wonders soar above us to the skies, winged and feathered ; or float, cold and silent, in the water. The air is filled with strange sounds ; a hundred winds, a thousand creatures, join the chorus. We lift a stone and hold in our hands the sepulchre of millions of microscopic creatures. Not one of these but has as firm a place in the universe as we, and either we must shut our eyes to them wholly, or we must admit them all into our experience, and name and acknowledge all.

But to attempt to embrace them all in detail would drive us to despair. We are saved by the happy suggestion of our intellect, which with the first sight of the particular facts exhibits also resemblances leading to laws by which they may be grouped. We see affinities, we obtain classifications, genera and species and varieties at once arrange themselves, eager to aid us ; these do not make the individual less important, they only leave us freer to dwell on its peculiarities. But this process is

not completed until we are able to extend it to Man also, include him as one class of facts in the vast whole, and determine his position and affinities.

This we do by a happy elasticity in our nature, enabling us to vary our attitude and point of view. As in our thoughts of the earth which rolls us on with it, we can habitually regard it as the centre of all things, and think of other planets and suns as mere satellites, and then can pass out of it in fancy and restore it to its own humble position among starry systems; so we can now view ourselves and our kindred race as the centre of existence, and again suddenly shrink to mere facts of a vast system, bound by certain eternal ties and laws to all other facts, humbler or higher.

The instant we do this, real intelligence begins; we are matriculated in the school of the universe. Once we saw only variety, we see unity now. No matter how immeasurable the array of particulars, give us only a general law, show the glimpse of a plan, and we can embrace them all as easily as one; in fact, the more the better, since they illustrate each other. The dignity of the universe begins so soon as we cease to regard it as an accidental combination of isolated thoughts of God, and view it but as *one thought of God*, an organic whole, each part answering to every other part; correspondence everywhere.

The Law of Unity;—we soon learn that all the observations of all the naturalists in all ages seem only to have elucidated this truth, that *creation is one*; different phenomena, different combinations, different planes, but the same identical law. Every thing in its place has a certain analogy to every thing else in its place, and the work of science is to trace this clew through all modifications. But the first instinct traces it also; the child starts upon the same track with the philosopher. The boy is eager to know about the sap in the tree; he studies with wonder its circulation and ramification. “Why, it is just like the blood in men and animals,” he says; “it is the same thing!” His parents laugh at the “accidental coincidence” of which the child makes so much; but the youthful philosopher never will be convinced that it is an accidental coincidence, and so much the better; *his guess was right*, he has discovered the Law of Unity,

and he may grow up to be Linnaeus or Agassiz, and only be able to say more assuredly, "It is the same thing." After all, the sap *is* the blood, and does its familiar duty; the individual is the same, only adopting different costume and manners for different spheres of society. We "see men as trees walking"; the same law bids both stand erect; the same law distributes among both the mysterious relations of sex. Each breathes the same atmosphere, for the tree kisses the air with a thousand moist lips in every leaf, and dies if you close them; only if you give it ether it dies a slow death, the sap stagnating beneath the microscope, as the blood does. We might continue the analogies. What are arms and legs but branches and liberated roots? muscles and tendons bind both; the skin renews itself as the bark does; and in a cross section of a bone no one can fail to notice the woody structure. Hair and nails in all animals are essentially vegetable; the young seeds of some plants cannot be distinguished from insect-eggs by the naked eye; and their receptacles are often strangely similar, as with the black four-horned egg-case of the skate, often found on our beaches, and usually mistaken for a vegetable product. And it is noticed by Agassiz, that, when tadpoles begin to develop into frogs, the new-born legs bear a precise resemblance to the buds of plants.

These coincidences are not accidental nor partial; if followed up, they lead us into one rigid, universal law of unity in variety. We have selected this one relationship of animal and vegetable; we might as well have looked in any other direction, into air, earth, or water. Earth shows us, for example, the identity of vegetation and crystallization; you may observe it, on any winter day, in the mimic forests of frost upon your window. Sometimes the crystals assume the form of feathers, sometimes of stars; but the vegetable look predominates. After a sleetly rain we have observed a spruce-tree of which every branch seemed to have a set of additional leaves of frost-crystals *built on* at the end of the natural leaves, so that, but for the difference in color, one could hardly, at the first glance, have distinguished them. Shall we look through the air? "As far as the heavens from the earth," we say; but Professor Peirce has shown that the self-

same mathematical law which distributes the stations of planets in the solar system, also distributes accurately the leaves in their spiral order around the stem of every plant. And as for water, (if here we may hazard a fancy of our own,) we have so often been impressed with the similarity between the sinuous and scalloped line drawn by every wave upon the beach, and the curvilinear grace of many vegetable forms, as especially of foliaceous lichens, that we live in the hope of some future professorial demonstration by the aid of the calculus.

We constantly come back to this, that all nature is fluid, and for ever glides into various, but always analogous forms, under the same identical law. We are startled when the naturalists exhibit to us the identity of the different parts of the same creature. The plant, for instance; what can seem more unlike than its various organs? Yet every botanist now accepts the Goethean hypothesis, which shows in the leaf the archetype of the plant, and in every organ only a transformed leaf. Look at the skeleton of a leaf, and you see a miniature tree; nay, according to a recent theorist, a miniature of the generic tree to which the leaf belongs. Look at a series of ferns, and you find a sort of graduated scale from a single leaf, through subdivision becoming the image of a complex tree. But apart from this external portraiture, we know the assertion true; the branch is a condensed leaf or leaves, the thorn a stunted branch; tendril, runner, tuber, are modifications of the same. We come to the flower; the calyx passes by natural gradations of bract and involucle from the leaf, and often is indistinguishable; there seems no reliable distinction between corolla and calyx; the stamens often pass into petals, as in the common white water-lily, where there are almost always some which do an uncertain duty. In double flowers, produced in rich ground, all the organs become petals, refuse their reproductive office, and the plant is barren. In short, each part of the plant, under the circumstances, is capable of transformation. For instance, in wet, warm springs, the flower-bud of the pear or apple tree is sometimes changed to a branch. Sometimes a branch will grow out of the end of the pear, or apple, or strawberry, or even out of a rose. These are called "monstrosities," but they are plainly subject to a law.

What seems at first sight more distinct than the branches and roots of trees? Yet they are essentially the same organs, modified for different purposes; and experiment has proved that you may turn the tree upside down, and see the branches put forth rootlets and the roots put forth leaves. Nay, constantly we see what illustrates the same truth. Let a root of a tree become exposed to the air, and the proper bark grows over it, and it soon sends out leaves and branches; a phenomenon identical with that of the armless young gentlemen of menageries and museums, who shoot pistols with their toes.

The same law of identity holds good of the animal structure likewise. The archetype of the skeleton is the vertebra, or rib; as each part of the plant is a transformed leaf, so is each part of the animal a transformed vertebra. The trunk is composed of these; and the arms and legs are but liberated, movable ribs. There is essentially the same series of bones in all vertebrate animals, only differently modified as leg, wing, or fin. The limbs begin to suffer a sea-change in web-footed animals, and in fishes and Cetacea the change is completed. "Every segment of the human arm and hand exists also in the fin of the whale, though they do not seem required for the support of that undivided and inflexible paddle." Fin and leg become wings in the flying-fish and bat; the paw of the bat is like that of the squirrel, but the thumb is stretched into a kind of boom, to which a membranous sail is attached. The rudiments of every organ appear in all these beings. There is nothing impossible in a winged man, but his wings would not be new and additional limbs, as in pictures of unscientific angels, but would insist upon employing the muscles of his arms for their service. If he will have a vertebrate system, he must take the consequences. All his kindred move by the same muscles, and so must he. Even his enemy, the snake, moves by the same members with man, though his limbs are concealed and man's are free. He wraps arms and legs, ay, and fins, in a party-colored cloak, and works his way over land and through water by the muscles. Give an animal but ribs enough, and it will have a body that can go anywhere and do any thing.

Nay, to go a step farther, even the head itself, the lofty and stately head, seeming so far removed from these

laws, yet strictly conforms to them. It is but *a concentrated body*, consisting of a series of transformed vertebræ, which Professor Owen will demonstrate to you from beginning to end ; "a new man on the shoulders of the other one." The organs of the body, too, are seen in the head,—jaws are limbs, with Pelopian ivory fingers. Among all animals there is a connection between the size and shape of these two sets of organs. "The jaws of insects," says Agassiz, "are modified feet." Or look at a bird of prey tearing his victim with talons and beak ; what are they but two sets of powerful limbs ? The lower and fiercer the man or animal, the more the jaws — or limbs of the head — are developed. In some animals, we see the transition as strikingly as we have exhibited it in the vegetable world. For instance, the common crab consists of a disk with a series of curvilinear appendages, of which the head is the centre ;— first and outermost paddles, then legs, then jaws hardly distinguishable from the rest, then mandibles, at the end of one of which we find an eye ; all these parts being only modifications of one and the same type. Lower down we find a greater economy of organization, the organs of head and body become the same ; and the common star-fish of our beaches carries his eyes at the ends of his five fingers, an unconscious clairvoyant. But in the higher orders, the aristocracy of nature, a separate set of vertebræ is permitted to each part of the body ; each part being, however (thus the anatomists teach us humility) only a transformed rib still ; which recalls with startling illustration the second chapter of Genesis.

To go yet a step farther. These are relations of *form* ; but if inquiry be made after the *material* of these things, we find no contradiction of what has been said. "Modern chemistry has shown by experiment that the transformations of matter are merely apparent, and consist solely of various combinations of the same particles. Bodies apparently the most distinct — for instance, starch, gum, sugar, fat, and the woody fibre of plants — are the same, or nearly so, in composition." There is only a difference of form, and through all the forms there runs, as we have shown, a singular law of identity, which joins the whole physical creation into a unit.

We have used the phrase *matter*. If any of our readers

can define it for us, it is more than we can do for ourselves. But we shall not interfere in the controversy of materialist and idealist. "It is all the same to us, since we can never test the accuracy of our senses"; and know whether there really be any thing hard, soft, sweet, sour, and the like, or whether it be only a peculiarity of our constitution to think so. Be that as it may, we are safe thus far, in asserting that, howsoever we define our terms, the material world not only corresponds at all points to itself, but corresponds to the spiritual world likewise; so that not only the physical universe, but the *whole* universe, is framed upon one idea.

To illustrate this, what a host uprise of analogies, figures, correspondences! Is there a statement of abstract truth which has not at some time been illustrated by a fact in nature, or a fact in nature which might not be stated in the abstract form it symbolizes?

The laws of nature are the laws of spirit; the truths of nature are the truths of spirit. Mythology, allegory, parable, proverb, metaphor, are all founded on this fact. Nay, language is founded on it, from beginning to end. Language has been best defined as "fossil poetry"; every word began as a trope. The metaphysical vocabulary was originally the physical vocabulary. Memory at once suggests countless illustrations in such words as *right, wrong, perverse, depraved, imagination, understanding, transgress, oppress, discern, submit, sincere, upright*, and so on indefinitely. These natural tropes do not rest on fancy, but on fact.

So there are other correspondences familiarly recognized in universal use, though not in etymology. Heart means feeling; head stands for thought. The connection between truth and light, darkness and ignorance, between love and warmth, indifference and cold, is unmistakable; there never lived a person who did not instinctively employ these as convertible terms. They stand related as the sap and the blood, the same individual in different costumes; what is true of heat is true of love, the phenomena of light are the phenomena of truth; the relation between heat and light in the physical sphere is that between love and truth in the spiritual, and so on for ever.

As we rise in the scale of creation these analogies only  
VOL. LIII.—4TH S. VOL. XVIII. NO. I. 11

become closer. Have we any virtue of which some animal is not the type, any fault of which there is not a brute parody? From bee to wasp, from ant to adder, from dove to hawk, from lamb to wolf,—nay, from lily to nettle, from rich grape to lurid henbane and loathly fungus and all the horrible catalogue of Shelley's Sensitive Plant,—

“Plants at whose name the verse feels loath,  
Prickly and pulpous and blistering and blue,  
Livid and starred with a lurid hue”;—

all these in turn attract us through their sympathy, or taunt us by their horrible mimicry of our follies and vices. They are always by us, and always faithful, these silent counsellors. Well says the quaint poet, Henry Vaughan,—

“Man I can bribe, and woman will  
Consent to any gainful ill,  
But these dumb creatures are so true,  
Nor gold nor gifts can them subdue”;

and wherever man may be in his sin, however far from human eye or ear, yet the first flush of consciousness shows all creation leagued against him; and, shot through and through by the keen arrows of these unconscious satirists, there is no escape from disgrace but in escaping from existence.

This strange identity of natural and spiritual laws is not the discovery of the learned, nor the invention of the fanciful; it is the instinct of man. All who come in contact with nature unconsciously recognize it. Talk upon the most abstract subject with a dozen men of a dozen different pursuits, and you will find that each resorts naturally for his phrases to the natural objects with which he has to deal;—the farmer to crops and cattle, the mechanic to wood, metal, or leather, the wood-cutter to trees, the sailor to winds and currents, the fisherman and hunter to the animals they deal with. They recognize the law of identity; that what is true in one sphere must be true in the other. As our lawyers cite the decisions of the English courts where ours are not in point, because, though the place be different, the common law is the same, so these men cite the facts of nature as valid decisions. On a farm, the maxims drawn from familiar animals alone, as dog, cat, sheep, crow, weasel, would form quite a little code of ethics and sagacity. And so

of more graceful images. "If there were no innocent souls," reasons the Oriental proverb with resistless cogency, "there would be no white lilies." Ask any abstract question, and it can as well be answered in physical facts as in any other way,—like picture-writing, hieroglyphics, or the "language of flowers." Begin anywhere to interrogate. Can we ever expect to obtain absolute uniformity of belief among men? asks some grave divine. No, replies Nature, for no two blades of grass are ever precisely alike. But is there no general rule without an exception? No; even the three-leaved clover sometimes has four leaves. Or ask a series of practical questions on "the conduct of life." When shall I act? "Make hay while the sun shines." How shall I act? "A rolling stone collects no moss." Will my action be ever appreciated? "Every fluid finds its level." Will it have influence? "The motion of a star alters the centre of gravity of the universe." Will that influence be lasting? Yes, for the smallest concussion upon smooth water makes a circle that continues widening on for ever. And so the symbolical language goes on. We wonder that "spiritual mediums" obtain answers from the legs of tables, and forget that every piece of wood comes of an oracular family, and every grove is Dodona. It really makes little difference where, at which end of the universe, we begin; we can get our questions answered anywhere. All creation is a hieroglyphical Bible.

It seems strange that men should have credited the "Doctrine of Correspondences" to Swedenborg, when it is as old and familiar as the senses of mankind. It is not only true that parts of the Bible have two meanings, but that every statement of material facts has two, three, or a dozen. Slight as is our present knowledge, we yet cannot find a fact in nature but has another inside of it, like a series of Chinese boxes. You cannot get one fact alone. Coleridge went to Sir Humphrey Davy's chemical lectures to obtain a new stock of metaphors. But we have only to keep our eyes open, and we have a new one every hour. We look into Agassiz's lectures, and read that "the branched ribs that support the wings of insects are the hardened remains of tubes through which the circulation was carried on in earlier years." It is a beautiful metaphor, but did we not know the truth

before? There never lived one but had, in the drying of the channels of earlier passions and joys, and the strength that came of it afterwards, precisely the experience written in hieroglyphics there, ages before his birth. Or we watch a moth emerging from the chrysalis. First he remains with his wings folded; then he unfolds them and remains stationary for many minutes, perhaps hours, waving them slowly in the air; then suddenly he begins to crawl, and runs vehemently forward for as long a time, seeming as if only born to run, and as if wings were all a fiction; content at last with this, he soars into the air, henceforth a matured being. Do we see no type of the progress of the soul in all this? — first, helpless infancy, then the strange questionings and thoughtful aspiration of the young child, the waving of the spirit's wings without actual ascending, — then the plunge into activity and apparent forgetfulness of all else, — and at last the combination of all these powers into a full, symmetrical experience. Shall we say that there is nothing in all this but accident, coincidence, and fancy? Say rather, that it is with the whole material universe as with the human eye; the more deeply we look into it, the more plainly we see our own eye looking back upon us, and we learn the essential unity of all created things.

For what have we said, that any simple, healthy mind cannot perceive as readily as the morning light? This is the blessing of intercourse with Nature, that she brings health to mind as well as body. Hers is the fresh air which the spirit also needs, and inhales as unconsciously as the lungs inhale it. She brings a wealth for the intellect and an essential innocence for the heart, which bear fruit in the most unreflecting hours. It is good for the soul to be absorbed in the play of the fish, and the shifting of the breeze, and the changes of seasons and hours, no matter if it seem to be in the most material way. We, too, find strength where Antæus found it. As for gardens, the ancient Tempter has quite forsaken them since men first built cities to accommodate him. And cares and temptations are like witches, that especially avoid a running stream. Alone in a boat on the river, with an hour of leisure before, who can be jealous or suspicious or ambitious or conceited? We lay aside our human responsibility, and become a part of the unconscious universe, —

"Rolled round in Earth's diurnal course,  
With rocks and stones and trees."

We have for a time the innocence and wisdom of animals and plants. Hence the pleasure we take in books of natural history and travels, even when very matter-of-fact. Hence the enjoyment the most thoughtful persons find in the society of out-door men, — sailors, farmers, lumber-men, stage-drivers, — at least so long as they are true to their pursuit, which is nature, and do not intrude their personal vices and meannesses. Hence the greater mental and moral attractiveness of such pursuits, and even of mechanical employments, as compared with the life of tradesmen. Nature admits the haystack and the boat to the freemasonry of her beauty; but she is less hospitable to the new block of red brick warehouses, and the Gothic town-hall.

Leaving these considerations, we pass now to the important question, How must Nature be studied?

1. We need hardly exhort more specially to a study of the *facts* of Nature, because that has been amply implied already, and because to most it does not occur that she can be studied *except* through the facts. Yet it ought to occur. Let us not, indeed, disparage the facts, but rather mourn that our senses are so little educated, and observe so little of what each day displays to them. Every child should be early taught the utmost precision of observation, almost to the extent of Dr. Johnson's proposition, to whip a boy who had made a mistake in stating which window he had just looked from. But this accuracy, after all, is more easily to be whipped into a child than another teaching without which this is vain. The visible facts of nature alone will never teach nature. The essential part of every animal, in Agassiz's judgment, is "the immaterial principle with which each is endowed, and which determines the constancy of species from generation to generation"; the *idea* or *law* of the animal. "To perceive mentally the law of any being's organization," said Cuvier, "is to be able to reproduce the animal without seeing it." These statements indicate a greater step in modern science than all its array of accumulated details can show. The essential part of each being is its idea; every created thing has in it a law of organization, by which alone it exists; and this is as true

of sand and granite as of man and beast. This living, plastic power is not the result of its existence, but constitutes its existence; remove it, and annihilation follows. "I know nothing more absurd," said Jacobi, "than to see in life only a product of things; it is rather things which are the product of life, of which they are only expressions and manifestations." The botanist, the anatonomist, often thinks himself studying dead matter; there is no such thing; he is studying life and organization and form; and these are intellectual things, to be intellectually embraced.

Now what enables the mind to embrace it? This chiefly, which we have said before, that the law of organization is a law of unity; all things are constructed upon one sublime idea. The intellect can follow the process of crystallization, because there is something within itself answering to that humble and beautiful law; it can understand the structure of a plant, because of its secret affinities with that lovely, blooming life. "Man vegetable and man animal speak to man human," it has been quaintly said. Nature in us reveals all the strange analogies which lie in the forms without us.

We come, then, to this, that Nature needs to be studied from within the mind as well as with the senses. If all things correspond, if there is not a profound beauty of the structure of the universe but is pictured transfigured in the divine spirit of man, and each added inspiration of this is an added revelation of hidden mysteries of Nature, then why dwell only on that which the eyes see, and neglect this way of deeper penetration? Zoroaster of old gave the name of "divine allurements" to the correspondences between material forms and the soul, and he left the aphorism that "he who knows himself knows all things in himself." Indeed, in all ages, microscopes and measurements have been only the servants of the profounder faculty which could, if necessary, dispense with them. "This will be found contrary to all experience," said Euler of his law of arches, "and yet it is true." Sir J. Herschel declares that "almost all the conclusions of astronomy are in direct contradiction to those of common experience, and with what appears to every one the positive evidence of his senses." The facts of our earlier pages were only adduced to illustrate the

great thought of Goethe, of the *transformation* of the one primary type throughout nature. Now, Goethe had no great claims as an experimental naturalist, and was here surpassed by many contemporaries ; yet he furnished the "one idea" of modern botany and comparative anatomy. Yet between such a mind and the mere observer there is always jealousy, and Schiller represented the latter position when he complained to Goethe on this very occasion, "That is not experience, but an idea"; as if experience had any value except as either suggesting the idea, or illustrating it.

Thus the first axiom in the study of nature is this :— Do not be afraid of your own thoughts; seek knowledge from within, as well as from without; there *is* a royal road to it, in proportion as you are accustomed to the recognition of general principles and laws.

2. We pass to the second maxim :— Do not be too utilitarian in your study of Nature ; love her for her own sake, give yourself up to her, without hampering yourself by impatience for an immediate result.

It is not to be denied that this maxim will appear to many the very opposite of the truth. Let us find shelter behind a remarkable letter from Liebig to Faraday.

"What struck me most in England," he says, "was the perception that only those works that have a practical tendency command respect, while the purely scientific, which possess far greater merit, are almost unknown. And yet the latter are the proper source from which the others flow. Practice alone can never lead to the discovery of a truth or a principle. In Germany it is quite the contrary. Here in the eyes of scientific men no value, or at least but a trifling one, is placed upon the practical results. The enrichment of science is alone considered worthy attention."

And yet this statement comes from the chief benefactor, in modern times, of the practical art of agriculture.

The truth is, that, in our own enjoyment of the common comforts of life which science has procured for us, we forget the amount of seemingly useless labor and investigation which preceded those results. We should be still in barbarism if scientific men had not worked by faith instead of sight, in the pure love of science. Innumerable processes, which mechanic art now easily per-

forms, required long series of patient speculation to attain them. This life of the past now exhibits itself in lifeless rules or implements or manipulations, which the spirit has created. Every machine-shop, every factory, is a mausoleum of speculative genius. Aristotle defined the ship-builder's art to be "all of the ship but the wood." The most ignorant worker in metal, in glass, or in pottery may be employing the highest results of chemical and mineralogical analysis. "The necessary fluidity to which is due the unrivalled sharpness and delicacy of the Berlin iron-work is owing entirely to the admixture of very minute chemical compounds, which it requires the most profound analytical investigations to determine." In the Sevres china manufactories, it is said that a single house spends ten thousand dollars annually in chemical experiments for the production of new colors. We need not dwell on the wonderful results of electro-magnetism, on telegraph and fire-alarm, or on the familiar miracle of the Daguerreotype, — all indirect results of the abstract inquiries of men who passed in the busy world for scientific idlers. And why not? Was not Sir Isaac Newton described by his neighbors as "a harmless insane gentleman, who spent whole days in blowing bubbles from his chamber window, and watching them as they floated away." And poor James Watt brought early on himself the parental displeasure, by wasting a happy twilight hour in experiments on steam by means of the domestic tea-kettle and the family's best silver spoons.

Nay, follow science where the absence of direct results seems even more complete, into the domain of pure mathematics and astronomy. What mighty consequences may yet, at any instant, follow from such inquiries. Comte says well of Archimedes and Apollonius, "The sailor, whom an exact observation of longitude saves from shipwreck, owes his life to a theory conceived two thousand years before, by men of genius who had in view simple geometrical speculations."

"Ignorance," says Fontenelle, quoted by Jacobi, "always regards that as useless of which it has no knowledge; thus it revenges itself. It says, 'Have we not our own moon to enlighten the nights? Of what use to know that the planet Jupiter has four? Why so many calculations to ascertain their precise position? We shall see none the clearer for them; and Nature,'

in placing these little stars so far from our eyes, seems not to have made them for us.' And yet those four moons of Jupiter, invisible to the naked eye, have been of far greater use to us than our own moon, which shines so brightly. Only since our acquaintance with them have geometry and navigation been able to make their most important advances, incomparably better maps and charts have been produced, and innumerable lives been saved.

"When in the seventeenth century the greatest geometricians employed themselves with investigating the nature of a new curve called the cycloid, they had no other interest in view than a merely speculative one, and had no conception what results might follow. But it was finally discovered, that, by means of this knowledge, the greatest possible perfection might be given to the pendulum, and the greatest precision be introduced in measuring time."

The truth is, that the practical application must always *follow* the scientific discovery, and will be commonly unexpected. Indeed, most useful inventions are compounded of several discoveries made at different times by different students, and whose practical results could not have been even guessed. "The ancients were acquainted with the magnet, but had observed only its power of attracting iron; had they gone a little farther with what seemed idle curiosity, they would have discovered its polarity likewise, and gained the inestimable prize of the compass." Pure mathematics on the one side, and chemistry on the other, had to labor for years before their combination could finally insure the wonderful results of the modern microscope and telescope.

Even were we to assume, then, (as we never can assume,) that these practical ends are the essential ones, and that the nobleness and delight of the study of nature are not their own exceeding great reward,— if it is not enough that it makes existence ever sublime to us, and beauty ever fresh,— we have yet to learn that these practical results must be sought only secondarily, if we would reach them. For so scanty are our means of attaining truth, that, if we do not concentrate them wholly on this end, but insist on carrying with us also the thought of an immediate result, we shall undertake too much and effect nothing.

It may be well to add, at this point, a singular in-

stance of the manner in which a mere scientific fancy, hardly deserving the name of a speculation, will sometimes so strangely correspond with a later discovery, as to suggest irresistibly the desire to find in it something more than an accidental coincidence. We refer to a semi-prophecy of the magnetic telegraph, which we have never seen noticed in any essay on that subject. Sir Thomas Browne, in his celebrated "Vulgar Errors" (A. D. 1646), gave a detailed account of what he calls "a conceit which is whispered through the world with some attention; credulous and vulgar auditors readily believing it, and more judicious heads not altogether rejecting it. The conceit is excellent, and, if the effect would follow, somewhat divine, whereby we might communicate like spirits and confer on earth with Menippus in the moon. And this is pretended from the sympathy of two needles, touched with the same loadstone, and placed in two *abcdary circles*, or rings, with letters described round about them, one friend keeping one and another the other, and agreeing on an hour when they will communicate. For then, saith tradition, at what distance of place soever, when one needle shall be removed unto any letter, the other by a wonderful sympathy will remove unto the same. *But herein my experience can find no truth.*"

And then he gives, very soberly, his experiment. But his experience would have found a truth had he lived two centuries later, since one of the most valuable improvements in the telegraphic machine (the indicating telegraph) gives it this precise form of "an abcdary circle," with a needle which, as the machine operates, points successively at the proper letters, thus spelling out its story.

3. Lastly, our study of Nature must be *reverent*. Her details are so vast, her law so profound, and our powers of study so scanty, that the utmost investigation only tends to show the need for something more. The most enlightened naturalist is most conscious of ignorance. Newton is a child collecting pebbles on the shore. In view of the vast amount yet to be known, we may not only say that little has been done, but almost that nothing has been done. Wordsworth has not yet begun to describe, nor Agassiz to explore. Even the encyclopedical power of knowledge which modern science has developed, the knowledge, for example, of Humboldt, is un-

able to keep up with contemporary investigations. No ordinary mind can entertain the accumulating details even of any one branch. For instance, in botany there is still no greater name than that of Linnæus. Linnæus enumerated about ten thousand species of plants. But the number now known to exist in various herbariums is more than two hundred thousand; and this is probably not more than half the number of existing species.

Thus the mere details of Nature are perpetually multiplying to our knowledge, and defying the explorer. But, as has been shown, the outside of Nature is her least important part. There is a spirit and a spell in her which cannot be pressed in an herbarium nor condensed in a text-book. The mysterious grace and glory of her life is something to which the most magnificent array of material details is trivial; and so she mocks, sooner or later, at all science and all art. We may analyze the light and the cloud, but who shall analyze the sunset? We may name every beast and every insect, but who shall take the first step to explore the *consciousness* of any one of these fair creatures, or make plainer the awful mystery that is in them? With all the simplicity of Nature's law, and all the correspondence we have found to our own spirit, she is yet inexhaustible. As an eminent American scholar once said of learning foreign languages, that, however thoroughly we think we learn them, there is always a veil left between them and our intelligence, to remind us that they still are not our own; so is it with us and Nature; we study her kindred races, we see the close correspondence, but there is always a veil. It is not so with books, it is not so with art; beings like ourselves have made them; sooner or later we can look through their eyes, and the works are to our highest moments only a matter of sympathy and interest, not of homage. There is no such familiarity with Nature. We study a moonlight or twilight by Allston; it is wonderful and glorious; but what depth is there in it, what resources, beside these other moonlights and twilights which God permits these poor senses of ours to gaze upon, month by month and day by day? There is a limit to the power of all thought and art; let the master once teach us his mighty secret, and lift us to his side by sympathy, and there is no wonder in his greatest work

compared with the simplest phenomenon of Nature's life. The bar that separates me from Shakspeare is nothing compared with the bar that separates me from the air I breathe. How can it be otherwise? When I read Shakspeare, I become identified with the spirit of Shakspeare,—burning with him, sighing, sorrowing with him; his magnificent inspirations thrill through me also, as a smaller wire throbs responsive to the vibrations of a larger one placed by its side. All that he creates in his characters he creates in me also, while I am under his spell; his inmost secrets may in time be revealed; but this air that sweeps by me, with its mysterious, invisible life, fresh and strong in Eden, fresh and strong now,—this is a stranger, nor is it plain how eternity can make it otherwise. Yet how entrancing the fascination which this very hopelessness gives to the pursuit of Nature, how inexhaustible the spell!

Yet we do wrong to say hopelessness, for there come at times from Nature mysterious hints and glimpses, which take us into the very heart of her existence. But these are not of our own choosing. It is one of the great mysteries, that there seems to be such a thing as looking at her too inquisitively and closely, and that this injures our sight of her. Astronomers say that indirect vision is more delicate than direct vision,—to catch the light of a very distant star most keenly, you must look at some star near to it. The truth is a very general one. Apparently it is not true of wild animals alone, but of stars and flowers also, that they run away and elude a too rigid scrutiny. Every faithful lover of Nature knows the meaning of Margaret Fuller's remark, that "Nature will not be stared at." She is like Napoleon, who "had the power of discharging all expression from his face when looked at too inquisitively." She loves those who obey her laws, and share her fresh spirit, and love her under every aspect, not those who cross-examine her for selfish purposes. Aristotle, says tradition, drowned himself in the river Euripus, in despair of discovering why it ebbed and flowed seven times a day, exclaiming, "*Si non capio te, tu capies me*,— If I cannot take you in, you shall take me in." We must all come to it at last,—immerse ourselves in Nature, become a part of her, if we wish to know her. Plotinus says: "Should any one at-

tempt to interrogate Nature, how she works,—if graciously she vouchsafe to answer, she will say, It behoves thee to go along with me in silence, even as I am silent and work without words." Then shall be fulfilled the beautiful prophecy of the Book of Job: "Thou shalt be in league with the stones of the field, and the beasts of the field shall be at peace with thee."

One thing more. We have endeavored to point out the universal law of correspondence between Man and Nature. We must not close without the question, Does this correspondence finally prevail as regards that law, the most important of all that concern the human race, the law of progress? We answer that it does, nay, that it holds more thoroughly and more strikingly than any other of these correspondences. The one great law of Nature, as of Man, is of progress, but with this startling circumstance, that here Nature separates herself in date from Man, and that her progress seemed to cease when and where his began. Let us explain. Stand in some museum of geology; look upon the vast, uncouth remains of an elder time; go back in imagination and see the gigantic bones of the Mastodon and Mylodon reclothed in flesh;—or visit some cave where animal remains are found, "look at the scattered bones, picture the period when those strange, monstrous beasts crowded in dense bands into the caves, driven by terror, finding death; or go farther back, to the time when hot volcanic action formed those caves, or wide-spread floods covered the land;—seems it not as if we lived to-day in a dream of futurity, children of eternal peace? How quiet, how serene, is our present nature, when compared with those fierce, gigantic times! The mightiest tempests, the most terrible earthquakes of our day, are but weak echoes of that earlier birth. We notice everywhere" (argues Novalis, whom we are quoting) "*a gradual elevation and pacification of Nature.*" We ask now, What can properly follow upon this process except the *elevation and pacification of Man also?* Towards man all orders of beings ascend; in man they are all summed up; he is the sole microcosm. Since his appearance no new species of plant or animal has been produced on earth. But the Creative Spirit may well cease from multiplying species, when the time has come to develop itself through

the free activity of a race of conscious beings. *Henceforth human development takes the place of physical*; Man now must be raised and harmonized, as Nature has been. All points to his progress. As geologists say that these extinct races of animals only coarsely typify the *immature state* of present races, so our cumbrous forms, beliefs, laws, organizations, must give place to newer and newer ones, including in a condensed and maturer form all their good, and adding wider good. Our slaveries and wars, nay, our armies and poorhouses, are as much signs of transition ages as the Megalonyx and Plesiosaurus; and we must leave them behind, if the great law of the universe holds true. So we are predestined to go on, "so build we up the being which we are." Seeing the nature within us and without us to be the same thing in varying forms, and both to be the very breath of God in the universe, we shall surrender ourselves to his leadings, and, coming more and more into harmony with creation, assume at length the position he designed for man, as its visible consummation and head.

But because all the eye sees is finite, and the hopes of the soul are infinite,—and since there is in all we know of creation no such thing as an ungratified hope, but in every grade of being we find desire proportioned to destiny,—we look forward to a time when even the beauty and glory of visible nature may prove a limit and a restraint, and, in a noble Oriental figure, "the eagle of the immortal soul shall shake from his plumage the dust of the body."

T. W. H.

---

## NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

---

*The New Series of Sunday School Manuals.* In Eight Volumes.  
Boston : Crosby, Nichols, and Company.

THE Course of Christian Instruction, which we announced in our last number as in process of preparation, has now appeared. After giving to the volumes which compose it such attention as we have been able to bestow upon them, we do not feel able to

pronounce decidedly upon their relative approach to our ideal of what such works should contain, nor do we wish here to go into a close criticism of their merits. The true and final test of their adaptation to their purpose will be the results which follow their use. We can hardly feel a doubt but that a fair trial of them by teachers who employ their own best abilities upon them, as well as upon their pupils, will prove that they are eminently valuable as a whole. If at any point the system which they recognize, or the means which they afford for realizing it, should prove inefficient or defective, they will make it comparatively easy of amendment, through their undeniably wisdom in their general plan and the larger portion of its details. We hope to date from the appearance of these little works a new and most propitious era in the cause of Sunday schools. There are two prominent advantages which they are eminently adapted to secure. First, they will make it more easy to find teachers, and will engage the interest of teachers. Undoubtedly many persons now shrink from that office, not from any lack of will or readiness to contribute something to the instruction of the young in religious principles and duties, but because they are unwilling to attempt this except in some systematic way. Heretofore, unless some peculiarly pleasant relations between teacher and pupils favored both parties, and continued the interest of successive weekly lessons, there was often a desultory, unprogressive course pursued, which never satisfied either party. Now a teacher has the means within his hands of carrying on a class through a regular course of instruction, or if he confines himself to one book of this series, and takes a new class through it each year, he may feel that the pupils, having been guided through the books which precede his own, or expecting to use those which follow after it in order, will come to him and go from him as still under a systematic training. The second chief advantage which we expect from the use of this series is that of establishing in the minds of the pupils an intelligible view of the relations which religious writings bear to religious truths and duties, of the use of the Scriptures, of the connection of their narratives with local scenes, of the way in which their contents are made instrumental to our improvement, and of the means which they afford for disclosing, interpreting, and enforcing the will of God. The fact, that the authors and compilers of these eight books have all had practical experience in Sunday schools, have been familiar with the defects that have appeared in them, and have united their efforts after a full mutual understanding of their common purposes, will do more to recommend the result of their labors than any thing that we could say.

The first book of the series, and properly the smallest, is entitled, "Early Religious Lessons." It is of the most simple

character, embracing a course of short lessons, each composed of a brief passage from the Bible, followed generally by a fragment of poetry. Here, of course, a sentiment or a truth is to be illustrated or impressed by the teacher. "Palestine and the Hebrew People" is the title of the second book, which is composed of questions referring to the geography of Palestine, the laws, customs, and life of its inhabitants, the answers being indicated by references to the Bible. The third book, "Lessons on the Old Testament," consists of questions founded on the narratives and incidents and characters of the Hebrew Scriptures, the lessons being preceded by illustrative matter. "Scenes from the Life of Jesus" is the title of the fourth book. In this the life of Christ is related in portions divided for lessons, and with a free mingling of the writer's own words with those of the Evangelists, so as to make the narrative more familiar in its tone. Each exercise is followed by a short prayer and by questions. The fifth book, entitled "The Books and Characters of the New Testament," is designed, to a certain extent, to serve as a basis for exhibiting the evidences of the Gospel history, and for illustrating the literary character and composition of the various Gospels and Epistles. It contains questions, the answers to which are to be learned by the pupil, and filled out or illustrated, if found necessary, by the teacher. "Lessons upon Religious Duties and Christian Morals" is the title of the sixth book, also by questions and answers. Here we have matter which may be conveyed in its simplest form, or most largely amplified and commented on by the teacher. The author of it says enough to meet the necessities of the case, and also indicates the line for further profitable remarks. "Doctrines of Scripture" is the title of the seventh book. The being and attributes of God, man's relations to God, the titles and offices of Jesus Christ, and the great themes of the New Testament religion, are here arranged under appropriate titles, with questions opening their instruction, and answers referring to the most clear passages of Scripture. The eighth and last book of the series is entitled, "Scenes from Christian History." This embraces a selection of some of the most impressive and remarkable incidents in Christian history, from the earliest times down to our own day. Of course, a volume so crowded with subjects can give but small space to each. While the brief relations which it offers are vividly and distinctly told, and would of themselves be sure to convey instruction and leave an impression, this book affords an admirable incentive to the teacher to make himself familiar with larger histories, that he may connect and amplify upon the contents of this volume.

Let the efforts of this partnership of laborers in one of the most serious and needful of all Christian enterprises be appreciated

by our societies ; let our Sunday school teachers bring to their work a desire to make the very best use of the rich and helpful means here afforded them, and the prospects of the next generation in our communion will be brightened.

We are glad to learn from the publishers that these works have been received with a spontaneous heartiness of interest. They have distributed some seven thousand copies, but have not met the demand for them.

---

*On the Study of Words.* By RICHARD CHENEVIX TRENCH, B. D. From the Second London Edition, revised and enlarged. New York : Redfield. 1852. 12mo. pp. 236.

THE way had been prepared for the most favorable reception of this pleasant volume among us by the lively article upon it and upon its subject-matter which appeared in Littell's *Living Age*, copied from an English magazine. While there is much that is purely fanciful, and something that is overstrained, in the author's suggestions concerning the origin of words, and the significations and associations, etymological or fortuitous, which they have acquired, there is in his book a prevailing spirit of wisdom, a real genius, and a liveliness, which would have justified him in going far beyond the modest limits of this volume. We heartily commend it to our readers.

---

*The Works of STEPHEN OLIN, D. D., LL. D., late President of the Wesleyan University.* New York : Harper & Brothers. 1852. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 422, 475.

DR. OLIN was one of the most scholarly and accomplished men in the Methodist connection in this country. His feeble health had compelled him to travel much abroad, and the works in which he has given his foreign observations have been well received. In these two volumes we have Sermons and heads or sketches of sermons, Lectures, chiefly on subjects connected with Christian education, Missionary Addresses, and Essays. These all bear the stamp of a vigorous mind in union with a zealous spirit. They cannot but contribute the full measure of one individual's hearty and earnest faith to the great cause which engages all Christians.

---

*The Principles of Courtesy: with Hints and Observations on Manners and Habits.* By GEORGE WINFRED HERVEY. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1852. 12mo. pp. 300.

THIS book is designed to do for Christians what Lord Chester-

field designed to do for men of the world, and *gentlemen*, in the popular use of the word. Its contents are almost entirely devoted to the exhibition of those principles of demeanor and behavior which should guide a religious man, and they take for granted the reception of those laws of conduct which are presented by Christianity. While we have found ourselves, here and there, questioning some of the minor maxims proposed by Mr. Hervey, we must give him the credit which belongs to him as actually the pioneer in the work to which he has devoted himself, and as having stated in a wise and forcible way many excellent counsels.

---

*A Manual of Grecian Antiquities. With numerous Illustrations.* By CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852. 12mo. pp. 457.

DR. ANTHON does not claim any original merit for his numerous works. He has a degree of skill in using the labors of others, and the work of instruction in which he is engaged acquaints him with the wants of pupils. If, however, he is as unexacting in what he requires of his pupils in hearing their lessons, as he is lavish in affording them facilities which almost make their own efforts needless, he must be a favorite with slack students. In the book before us he has done for Grecian antiquities what he had before done for those of Rome,—presenting a brief compend of larger works on that subject.

---

*An Exposition of some of the Laws of the Latin Grammar.* By GESSNER HARRISON, M. D., Professor of Ancient Languages in the University of Virginia. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1852. 12mo. pp. 290.

WE suppose that this volume embraces some of the conclusions and results of the author's repeated routine of study and instruction in the Latin language. One who must frequently go over that round of verbal work, and with all the parts and elements which enter into it present at once distinctly in his mind, has admirable opportunities for doing what this author appears to have done admirably well. His book is in no sense a Grammar. It aims to give not so much the philosophy as the constructions and variations or exceptions which prevail in the etymology and the syntax of the Latin tongue, taking for granted in his readers a knowledge of its grammar.

*An Elementary Treatise on Plane and Spherical Trigonometry, with their Applications, &c., &c.* By BENJAMIN PEIRCE, Perkins Professor of Astronomy and Mathematics in Harvard University. Boston and Cambridge : James Munroe & Co. 1852. 8vo. pp. 359.

THIS is a new edition, with additions, of the valuable text-book on Trigonometry which has had, perhaps justly, a more extended use than any other of Professor Peirce's elementary series. The duodecimo form has been changed to octavo, and many new examples for practice are added. It is now as thorough in its practical training as in its analytical beauty. There is no department of mathematics more bewitching in its simple beauty than Trigonometry, and no treatise within our knowledge affords so simple and so attractive an introduction to its charms.

We can only wish that, before publishing this new edition, a careful proof-reader had removed certain slight defects arising from some inattention, or from the progress of discovery since the book was written. The definition of a vertical line, for example, (p. 169,) needs a slight alteration or addition ; and it is of course impossible that a Professor of Astronomy should in 1852 enumerate (p. 171) only four asteroids, and in naming the planets omit to mention the one whose discovery, by means of the pencil rather than the telescope, is the greatest triumph of mathematical astronomy ever achieved.

---

*Eleven Weeks in Europe : and what may be seen in that Time.*

By JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE. Boston : Ticknor, Reed, & Fields. 1852. 16mo. pp. 328.

IN such descriptions as Mr. Clarke offers, and to which, for the most part, he confines himself, the shortness of the time which he had for observation hardly makes any abatement on the score of accuracy or justice. Many things, when looked upon by a discriminating and intelligent observer for a few hours or days, may be described with more vividness and felicity by him, than by one whom long familiarity with them has dulled. There is a freshness and vigor in Mr. Clarke's sketches, and a terseness and point in the reflections which he intersperses among them, which make his book as attractive as is any similar work known to us. He went over the ground which most visitors to Europe from this country are likely to traverse, and such could scarcely have a better road-book than his. Readers of such works are well aware, that, though the same scenes and objects furnish the subject-matter of their contents, yet the varieties of judgment, the differences of mental and bodily vision, and the style of presentment which different tourists connect with them,

cause their pages to be as unlike as if they were writing on other themes. Mr. Clarke's readers will acknowledge that he offers them novelty, as well as good information and wise remark.

---

*The University Speaker : a Collection of Pieces designed for College Exercises in Declamation and Recitation. With Suggestions on the Appropriate Elocution of Particular Passages.*  
By WILLIAM RUSSELL. Boston : James Munroe & Co. 1852.  
12mo. pp. 528.

MR. RUSSELL is so well known among us for his professional skill as a teacher of elocution, and has already so proved his abilities and judgment in the preparation of books for pupils in that department, that a new work from him needs no indorsement from us. We have looked through his new volume, and can heartily testify to its merits. His selections have a high literary and historical interest of their own, and his introductory hints for the proper understanding and reading of the several pieces will make them doubly acceptable to those who are to read them or to commit them to memory.

---

*The Antigone of Sophocles, with Notes, for the Use of Colleges in the United States.* By THEODORE D. WOOLSEY, President of Yale College. New Edition, revised. Boston and Cambridge : James Munroe and Company. 1851. pp. ix. and 140.

THE Antigone, as now presented to us, is improved in many particulars. The Preface has been enlarged by the introduction of a critique on Boeckh's view of this play ; the text has received further corrections ; and the notes, though still limited to about the same number of pages as before, have been much altered ; many having been rewritten, a few omitted, and some important ones added, especially from the latest critics. Great learning has been devoted to the Antigone by foreign scholars, and it has been translated and explained by Professor Boeckh and others in Germany, and by Dr. Donaldson in England. The very abundant and valuable literature on Sophocles the editor appears to have had at hand, and our only wonder and disappointment is that he did not draw from it more freely. So much has been done for the Greek dramatists, first by the illustrious scholars of England, and after them by the Germans, that an editor might now deserve perhaps the highest praise, if he attempted the task of a mere compiler, selecting his materials with sound judgment and good taste from the rich stores already laid up for use.

These studies are in most respects so difficult, that an editor's labors, to answer the best purpose, should be copious as well as

exact. In reading President Woolsey's editions of the Tragedies, while we have seen and felt the value of what he has given us, we have wished for much which he has not given. Amid the references to grammars and lexicons and the works of verbal critics, valuable, indeed, and even indispensable though they are, we have wished more frequently to see one dramatist interpret the usages of another in respect to words and phrases, and have sometimes thought we missed a varied and elegant illustration and development of the grand *γνῶμαι* and the graceful and delicate sentiments in these pieces, and a nice discernment of the peculiar subtleties of the Greek poetic diction. But we would make our acknowledgment of what aid the editor has rendered us in this matter, rather than complain; and his uncommonly careful method of annotating, his fair treatment of the labors and views of other editors, his conscientious and reverential mode of dealing with his authors, cannot be sufficiently praised: these things exert their influence on the mind and spirit of the student, though he may be unconscious of it, and assist in forming his intellectual habits and in determining his social qualities. One of the highest results of the study of antiquity is thus attained,—a respect for what is just, and a love of what is beautiful and good, whenever and wherever it is found.

The commentary on the Antigone is not, we think, surpassed in excellence by any other work of the editor, but we add a word on a few of the notes, before we take leave of the book.

On verse 43, *ξὺν τῇδε χερὶ* is rendered "*with my hand, me.*" But *τῇδε* seems here to be employed *δεικτικῶς*, to use a term of the grammarians, as in v. 758. So Dr. Donaldson gives it: "*this hand of mine.*" Compare Virg. *Aen.* II. 291, 292:—

“*Si Pergama dextra  
Defendi possent, etiam hac defensa fuissent.*”

V. 200. The use of *κατά* in the sense assigned to it in the compound verbs here given, and of *ἀνά* with a contrary import, deserved a careful explanation.

V. 406. The interchange of the present and aorist tense in this verse is not noticed.

V. 567. No explanation is made of the construction in *ἄλλ' ἥδε μέντοι μὴ λέγ'*. We should have expected *τὸ τῆσδε — μὴ λέγ'*, with *τῆσδε* repeated from the foregoing; as in Dem. *Orat. de Corona*, § 88: *ὑμεῖς — τὸ δ' ὑμεῖς ὅταν λέγω κτέ.*

V. 1342. A reference to v. 2 remains here, as if the editor in the present edition still adhered to *ἢ τι*, his former reading in that verse.

This work, like all the others of President Woolsey, is printed with singular accuracy. We have remarked, however, on p. 8, l. 7, *δρᾶν*, and on p. 92, l. 13, *τιμᾶν*, while on p. 24, l. 12, we

find δρᾶν, and on p. 48, l. 6, the same ; and on p. 117, last line, γένεσθαι.

"The Minister and Parish" is the title of a discourse delivered March 28, by Rev. Dr. Hill of Worcester, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of his ordination. It is the record of a quarter of a century's labors and experiences in one of the most pleasant of New England towns, and over one of the most enviable of the religious societies of the State. Dr. Hill, in a cheerful and serious tone, reviews the years which have passed over him with their changes, and in the statement of his own views and aims he reveals to us the conditions which have secured to him a most useful and peaceful ministry.

"A Sermon delivered before the Boston Society for the Prevention of Pauperism, May 9, 1852, by Rev. Edward E. Hale," may be regarded as presenting the religious view of those facts which the author had already made public in his pamphlet on Emigration ; and also as giving the results of all the discussions which have recently thrown light upon the sad theme here treated.

"The Beneficent Woman" is the appropriate title of a discourse preached by the Rev. Dr. Young of this city, in the church on Church Green, May 23, 1852, the Sunday following the decease of Mrs. Catharine G. Prescott. Here was indeed a rare opportunity for the exposition from the pulpit of the elements and traits of character which constitute the ideal of a Christian matron. Dr. Young has not failed to do justice to his attractive theme, nor to point its moral and illustrate its fruitful applications, in a sketch of the life and virtues of his esteemed parishioner. It is refreshing to turn from the coarse and obtrusive manifestations which some women have recently made of themselves by leaving their sphere, to the contemplation of a life so beautiful and so useful as that of Madam Prescott. The preacher evidently had in his mind the whole force of the contrast thus presented, and by delicate intimations, rather than by an actual drawing out of that contrast, he makes the former part of his discourse pregnant with wise and impressive lessons. His sketch of the marked traits of character in the beneficent woman whom he commemorates is evidently drawn from a long and intimate acquaintance with her,—extending over a quarter of a century,—and from a sincere reverence for her virtues. She was indeed a most excellent and useful woman, an attractive example of all that is engaging in a female character, and of all that is useful, devoted, and worthy in the Christian model. We have shared her kindness. It is easy for us to conceive of her as living now in a state conformed to the best uses of her life on the earth.

## INTELLIGENCE.

## LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Messrs. Crosby, Nichols, & Co. have published a volume of Sermons by Rev. Dr. Frothingham, late pastor of the First Church in this city. We hope to do justice to this volume in our next number.—The same firm has issued “A Manual of Devotions for Families and Sunday Schools,” prepared by Rev. J. H. Allen, of Bangor, Me. This Manual is suited for use in the household, in day schools, and at occasional public services. The compiler is chiefly indebted to the Liturgy, though he has engaged the aid of friends in other selections and in a few original pieces.

Messrs. James Munroe & Co. have published a third edition of “A Manual of Prayer, for Public and Private Worship; with a Collection of Hymns.” This is the service-book which was prepared ten years ago by the Rev. Mr. Eliot of St. Louis, for the use of his society. It has commended itself to general approval among those who think that our public services might be conducted with more devotional effect through some such aid, than by the old method of the Congregational churches. We should think that the number of hymns in this collection—there being but two hundred and seventy-two—was too limited for the various uses and occasions of public worship. It is plain that the question of service-books, or liturgical forms, is soon to be debated anew among us, as there are a few persons in our societies who are urgently desirous of introducing such aids to devotion.

The same firm has published a very pleasant story, by Julia Day, under the title of “The Old Engagement. A Spinster’s Story.” The title itself is a skilful one, and is an earnest of the frank communicativeness and the revelations of heart which will be found in its pages.

The Messrs. Harper of New York have republished in a neat form, in one volume, the Life and Letters of Niebuhr, which we commended to our readers in our last number. The English edition of this excellent work was so expensive that the wisdom in its pages could reach but few. Now it will have a wide circulation.—The same firm has also reprinted the translation of the fourth volume of Humboldt’s *Cosmos*, a book already sufficiently discoursed upon in our pages to lead our readers to the vast stores of instruction which it offers.—The beautiful serial work in course of publication by the Harpers, Lossing’s *Field Book of the American Revolution*, has reached its twenty-third number, and will be completed in one or two more numbers.

Messrs. Gould & Lincoln, who have published a large number of most useful elementary works containing the most recent fruits of science, have issued “The Elements of Geology, adapted to the Use of Schools and Colleges. By Professor Justin R. Loomis.” The volume is admirably suited to its uses, and is highly trustworthy.

Messrs. D. Appleton & Co. continue to add new and most interesting volumes to their “Popular Library of the Best Authors.” The epithet

which they have attached to this series of books has been well justified in the acceptance and favor which the volumes have met with. Embracing, as they do, a great variety in their contents, but always aiming to convey the very wisest instruction, whether through satire or a more sober vehicle, they give us the cream of our contemporary literature. For the traveller, the summer tourist, or the lover of pleasant reading at home, the books will be found the most desirable companions, as they are easy to carry, easy to hold, and most agreeable in the perusal. The Paris Sketch Book, in two volumes, by Thackeray; The Ingoldsby Legends, by Barham; and a selection of papers from the Quarterly Review, are the last additions to the series. Humor, satire, marvels, and sober facts, presented with all the skill and vigor of lively pens, are made the mediums of imparting a genial wisdom and a harmless amusement. — The same firm have reprinted the beautiful story by Julia Kavanagh, entitled, "Madeleine: a Tale of Auvergne"; and also a posthumous work of Grace Aguilar, called, "The Days of Bruce, a Story of Scottish History." This story is edited by the mother of the deceased writer, and while there is enough in the veritable history of the hero and the incidents which it portrays to give it a sufficient and absorbing interest, the graceful pen of the writer adds many charms of its own.

From the same firm we have a volume of less than two hundred pages, entitled, "The Diplomacy of the Revolution: an Historical Study, by William Henry Trescot." This is a happily chosen theme, and the volume will be valued as an introduction or as a termination to a course of reading on our Revolution. Our relations to the other European powers during our war with England, the secret and public negotiations opened with them, the circumstances and events in their polities which had an influence on the fortunes of the United States, and the final measures for peace with Great Britain, are here succinctly and accurately related. We have thus in a very modest form much pregnant matter judiciously presented.

Redfield, of New York, has published in a beautiful form a new edition of the Poetical Works of Fitz-Greene Halleck, with some additional pieces. This favorite among American poets may rely upon an established reputation among all readers of English, from the schoolboy who loves to declaim his Marco Bozzaris, to Samuel Rogers, who, as the Rev. J. F. Clarke in his "Eleven Weeks in Europe" tells us, read in his presence the poem beginning "Green be the turf above thee," and added, "No man living can write such verses now." — The same publisher has issued a work by Dr. W. W. Hall of New York, on "Bronchitis and Kindred Diseases, in Language adapted to Common Readers." The book contains the best information and advice that are to be had upon its subject, and we commend it to all sufferers by that afflictive malady.

We are pleased to learn that Professor Felton of Harvard College has undertaken to prepare a memorial of the late Rev. Dr. John Snelling Popkin, his predecessor in the Eliot Professorship of Greek Literature. This is wholly a labor of love on the part of Mr. Felton, and we are glad that not only his own relationship of office, but an appreciative regard and esteem for the subject of his editorial pen, has moved him to the work. No one could perform this kind service in a better spirit or with more competent ability and information. The beautiful and kindly notice of Dr. Popkin which appeared in the Boston Daily

Advertiser, shortly after his decease, was then understood to have been written by Professor Felton. This, we understand, is to be the basis of the Memoir, which will be enriched by contributions from the Hon. D. A. White and others, contemporaries and friends of Dr. Popkin. Certainly the opportunity is a rare one, for drawing the portraiture of a somewhat eccentric, but most upright, scholarly, and faithful man, who, whether as a minister or an instructor, left upon those who knew him the impression of thorough integrity, of quaint wisdom, and of a discerning spirit, which looked farther into things and persons than the tongue always declared. If the book is ready on the coming occasion which is expected to draw the Alumni of the College from far and near, we think that the late Dr. Popkin's pupils will be eager to secure it, and to accompany the perusal of it with a running commentary furnished by their own memories. The volume is to contain the three Lectures on Liberal Education which were published in a pamphlet some years ago, some selections of other Lectures, and a few sermons, most of which have never appeared in print.

#### RELIGIOUS INTELLIGENCE.

*Anniversary Week.* — So far as our own observation extended, we accord with the judgment which we find to be generally expressed in the papers and in conversation, that the exercises of Anniversary Week and the impressions made by them were of a highly satisfactory character. Without presenting any thing extraordinary or startling in the materials which entered into them, or offering any disturbing elements to excite bad feelings, they were serious and devotional in their prevailing spirit. Like all other human devices, these crowded gatherings and numerous associations bearing sacred titles must partake of imperfections. At the season of the year in which the seed of all our crops, the sustenance of our physical life, is committed to the ground, these meetings sow their seed, and lay their plans, and renew their efforts to cultivate the great field of Christian labor, — the whole world. Taken in the sum and fulness of their design and agency, they stand to remind us, in a very forcible way, that the great promise of the Saviour still lives in human hearts, and finds those who aim to fulfil it. That promise is, that the holy leaven of truth and love which he introduced into the world — which he *hid*, to use his own figure, — hid under the shows and surfaces of things — should never cease to work ; but should mingle with all the agencies of human life, should appear in some evidences of its presence through every age, should inspire prayer and effort, should unite men and women in the sympathies of good works, and should set before every individual some way or method of promoting the purposes of the Gospel. If Anniversary Week did no more than merely stand as a token that what the Saviour said eighteen hundred years ago is not forgotten, but remembered, and believed in, and held as an aim that is possible and that ought to be kept in view, with efforts to realize it, that week would have a higher meaning and a nobler consecration than any other week of the whole year. It is a memorial of the unceasing, active, planning spirit of Christian benevolence ; a monument, inscribed with sacred names and duties, to the great Head of the Church. The chief persons in these meetings are those who teach and influence in various ways all the other members of the community, who

draw out and gather up our charities, who write our books, and edit our journals, and guide in many most important directions the sentiment of our large public circles. What they receive at these meetings they distribute again. These meetings, to a certain extent, represent the great Christian activities of the age. There is in them a power which works upon the world, which tells upon the actual wants and sins of the world. No one who is himself heartily engaged in any good work ever doubts of the efficiency of any good design or enterprise ; and no other person is a judge in the case. We need not exaggerate the real influence of these public meetings, with their addresses and discussions. They do not accomplish the hardest nor the highest work of life, for that each person has to do in and upon and for himself. But there is a place in every large community for such agencies and efforts. They vindicate their use by continuing year after year to gather assemblies. The tongue, as at the first Christian Pentecost, may be in them the principal instrumentality, but tongues are not patiently listened to on such occasions, unless they are inspired by just and living sentiments.

We proceed to make our usual brief record of such of the meetings as claim a notice in our pages.

*The Massachusetts Bible Society* held its Annual Meeting in the Winter Street Church, on Monday afternoon, May 24th, the President, Hon. Simon Greenleaf, in the chair. Prayer was offered and selections from the Scriptures were read by Rev. Mr. Holdrich, Methodist. Rev. Dr. Parkman, the Secretary of the Society, read the Annual Report. The usual method of proceeding — by which speakers representing various religious denominations are engaged beforehand to address the meeting — was observed on this occasion. Speeches were made by Rev. Dr. Vinton, Episcopalian ; Rev. Mr. Janes, Methodist ; Rev. T. S King, Unitarian ; Rev. Dr. Sears, Baptist ; and Rev. Mr. Whiting, Orthodox Congregationalist. The highest encomiums have been passed upon the eloquent and fervent speech of Mr. King, which brought out with a most impressive force the wealth and power of the Bible, in its biographies and portraiture, its development of the great moral elements of character, and its illustrations through human life of its own solemn doctrines. Even the brief sketch of this speech which has been reported will convey to its readers some portion of the pleasure and instruction which it imparted to its hearers.

*The American Peace Society* held its Annual Meeting in Park Street Church, on Monday evening, May 25, a thronged congregation being present. The Address was delivered by Rev. F. D. Huntington, and was of a most able and impressive character. When it appears in print, the wise way in which the speaker treated the mischievous enterprise of Kossuth in this country will command general approbation. We are sorry to learn that the discord which for two years has agitated the business meetings of this Society, and which is so painfully inappropriate to its harmonious objects, is not yet quieted.

The Annual Meeting of the American Unitarian Association took place on Tuesday, May 25th. The business affairs of the Association engaged the forenoon at the chapel of the Church of the Saviour. The President, Rev. S. K. Lothrop, occupied the chair. Prayer was offered by Rev. Joseph Richardson of Hingham ; portions of the Annual

Report were read by the Secretary, Rev. Calvin Lincoln; and Henry P. Fairbanks, Esq., Treasurer, stated the receipts and expenditures of the Association. The officers elected by ballot for the year ensuing are as follows: *President*, Rev. S. K. Lothrop; *Vice-Presidents*, Rev. E. B. Hall, D. D., and Hon. Stephen Fairbanks; *Executive Committee*, Isaiah Bangs, Esq., Hon. Albert Fearing, Rev. H. A. Miles, D. D., Rev. G. W. Briggs, and Rev. W. R. Alger; *Secretary*, Rev. Calvin Lincoln; *Treasurer*, Henry P. Fairbanks, Esq. The public exercises were held in the Rev. Dr. Gannett's church, Federal Street, where prayer was offered by the Rev. James W. Thompson, D. D., and the Report of the Secretary was read at length. This document was of a most interesting nature, and while it presented in due prominence those denominational views and obligations which befitted the occasion, it made all sectarian efforts subservient to the sacred cause in which all Christian hearts are united. A spirit of fervent and modest piety, a zeal tempered by wise experience, and a knowledge of the practical obstacles and encouragements in the way of our work, were striking features of this Report. Three points were made prominent in it: the motive which we as Unitarians have for our denominational efforts; the view which we cherish of the Saviour, as our hope and the world's Redeemer; and the necessity of missionary zeal in our body. The President made these three points into leading heads of remark, under which he called for Hon. Samuel Hoar, Rev. F. H. Hedge, Rev. E. E. Hale, and Rev. A. P. Peabody, to address the meeting successively. These gentlemen complied with his request, and the evening was profitably spent under influences eminently devotional and inspiriting. The Rev. Mr. Shippen of Chicago, a delegate from the Western Unitarian Conference, responded briefly to a welcome extended to him, and expressed the grateful feelings of Unitarians at the West for the fraternal aid and sympathy which they had received from this region.

The form which the self-criticism, so common with us, took in the discussion connected with our business meeting, was the assertion, in most unqualified terms, that our zeal and liberality fell far short of our duty and ability, and brought us into unfavorable comparison with other denominations of Christians. To the former part of this charge we fully assent. Indeed, that is always a safe accusation for every class of men, and for every individual man, to utter in self-judgment. The latter portion of the charge — that we are relatively not so liberal, in our donations for what we regard religious objects, as are other denominations — was at once brought into question. Lacking, as we do, that harrowing motive which our Orthodox brethren professedly feel as the impulse of their missions to the heathen, namely, a belief that an ignorance of the Gospel insures their everlasting perdition, we, of course, do not devote money to that special object. Not believing, as other bodies of Christians profess to believe, that the doom of nominal Christians depends upon the speculative and doctrinal opinions which they may hold, we cannot be expected to be as zealous as they are in the propagation of a creed. But taking our own estimate of the whole province, work, applications, and intended effects of true Christianity, we believe that our gifts to advance its humane and sacred purposes, while affording us no occasion for boasting even before men, will at least secure us from all reproachful comparisons with other bodies of Christians. Our funds go rather to the relief and comfort of the poor, to instruct and protect the sailor, the orphan, and the widow, and to spread the blessings of educa-

tion and good culture, than in any direct efforts in behalf of our doctrinal creed. And even when our several churches and congregations, or members of them, contribute money to build up or aid societies of our own faith, only a very small proportion of the funds is given through this Association, to be recognized through the report of our Treasurer.

This periodical having been established for the statement and defense of those views which are known by the epithet *Unitarian*, or, as some prefer to entitle them, *just and liberal and rational views of Christianity*, it is but proper that from year to year we should take particular note of the progress and prospects of a cause which is so very dear to us. For ourselves, we have learned to look for encouragement as to the steady, though gradual, progress of our distinctive religious opinions, and to find the conditions under which alone that progress will be made, in the historical facts involved in the development of Unitarian opinions at various periods of time. After the third century, the Trinitarian theology had wellnigh supplanted the simple doctrines of the New Testament. A train of agencies and circumstances similar to that which substituted for Gospel freedom, purity, and spirituality, the devices of prelatical and ecclesiastical despotism, the ritual, the hierarchy, and the superstitious practices of Rome, substituted also a doctrinal and philosophical system very unlike to that of Christ and his Apostles. The opportunities and influences which tended to extend and confirm this perverted system were very many and very powerful, and they have never been sufficiently allowed for or insisted on. Philosophy corrupted the Gospel for the learned; credulity, ignorance, and mental inaction made the mass of the people to be the easy disciples of a false theology. The religious systems advocated by the learned were based on the elements of the old paganism, and the Christian superstructure conformed itself to the foundation. A selection might be made from the writings of the Fathers, which would leave it doubtful whether the old heathen elements of a polytheistic, sacrificial, and ritual faith, or the new leaven of the Gospel, predominated in their minds. The popular religion was received from such teachers, and for a long period we find precisely the same phenomena in Christian history which we find in Jewish history,—a pure faith struggling against the stupid and clouded fancies of half-enlightened minds, and religious observances strangely partaking of the most incongruous forms and practices. Of course the Christian element was constantly seeking to clear itself from its corrupt admixtures, but through the Middle Ages a system of doctrinal and ceremonial religion had established itself which presented at every point something wholly inconsistent with true Christianity. At the Reformation the Trinitarian doctrines did not pass unquestioned, although the stress and heat of the strife were about other matters. The standard translations of the Scriptures into all the modern languages were made by men biased by Trinitarian opinions, and many passages may be indicated which show this bias, one of the effects of which, of course, was to make those passages available as proof-texts for Trinitarianism up to this day. But now the striking fact presents itself to our notice, that, in spite of all the influences of established and prevailing sentiments, the force of prejudice, and the tendency of education in and under Trinitarian doctrines,—obstacles very difficult to overcome,—an almost unbroken line of Christian scholars may be traced through every age, who obscurely or distinctly intimate that they rejected the dogmas whether of Augustine or Calvin, and accepted those views which we embrace.

And a yet more striking fact presents itself as the ground of our confidence in the extension of our peculiar views of the Gospel. A half-century ago, nearly a whole generation of Christian ministers and laymen in this Commonwealth slowly divested themselves of Calvinistic opinions, and as slowly adopted the views which are now known as Unitarianism. This is a most signal testimony, and one very difficult to refute or invalidate. The only attempt which has ever been made to meet the force of this fact, and of the inferences which a candid mind would draw from it, involves a charge of insincerity and concealment against a number of as excellent and honorable persons as have ever lived, and who had no motive for such deception. This absurd charge is fairly met by the considerations, that that remarkable change of opinions was a very slow one, and was made by unconscious stages; that it was taken up by one generation where it had been left incomplete by the preceding generation; that the subjects of it, as Protestants and independent Congregationalists, were not bound to declare from day to day the phases of their religious opinions; and that they rejected the title of *Unitarians* when first applied to them, because of the radicalism and materialism which were associated with it in England. But the fact is a most remarkable one, let what will be said of its incidental, temporary accompaniments. Here was a large number of ministers, the honored pastors of our churches, men of learning and integrity, and respected for their private and professional characters, men educated in Calvinism, who renounced it. Here were laymen,—magistrates, judges, intelligent merchants, clear-headed farmers, and mechanics,—men in all the walks of life, respected and confided in; women, too, of high culture, of true piety, and famed in all the household virtues;—all educated as Calvinists, but whose hearts and faith it failed to satisfy.

The subjects of this marked change of religious or doctrinal sentiment had made a faithful study of the Bible. Among the papers of those old ministers, and of some of the more prominent laymen, have been found elaborate notes from the study of the Scriptures, in which are balanced texts and arguments, showing the process by which truth worked against early and strong prejudices. The subjects of that change were also warmly attached to religious institutions. Indeed, every noble Christian enterprise received an impulse from them. They were free to think for themselves. They were unawed by any ecclesiastical authority. If they were prejudiced at all, it was in favor of the views which were identified with an honored ancestry, and which were associated with their own religious training in youth. There could not possibly have been a more decisive token of the lack of truth and power in the peculiar tenets of New England Orthodoxy, than the gradual and quiet manner in which it decayed, without being assailed. It was surrendered by those who were born and trained to be its defenders. Nor did they condemn, much less aim their open hostility against it, until what they had discovered to be the rottenness of Orthodoxy was proposed to them as the very life of the Gospel. We maintain that true Christian experience, a devotional and intelligent study of the Scriptures, a desire to be free from all prejudices, a conscious responsibility to only such laws as are conformable to the manifest will of God, and a hearty desire for a faith which should satisfy the affections and the reason, were the instrumentalities of this remarkable change of doctrinal belief half a century ago, in New England.

Nor only in New England, but all over Christendom, have those same causes wrought the same and similar effects. They explain to us the religious history of such distinguished Christian scholars as Grotius and Le Clerc. They account for the rise among the English Dissenters of a class of Christians who, for their lives, characters, and labors, may claim universal respect. Holland and Geneva have witnessed the operation of the same causes with the same results. The Established Church of England is well known to have retained the nominal allegiance of many distinguished divines and laymen, — of these, however, we will make no boast, — who needed only more clearness of vision, or consistency of thought, or candor of declaration, or superiority to some domestic or conventional feelings, to have caused them to be ranked as witnesses to the same truth. Even in Rome, and throughout Roman Catholic Italy, there have been, from the period of the Reformation up to this day, very many Unitarians.

Now our ground of confidence in the gradual and steady extension of our views is found in the simple law, that the same causes will produce the same effects. We are perfectly willing to rest our hope for the increasing prevalence of our doctrinal opinions, upon what we consider the most honorable and cogent fact in their past history. We accept, too, the same terms and conditions of further progress as appear to have prevailed heretofore. It is a rather singular and very significant truth, that Unitarianism seemed to win its most difficult and most extensive conquest when there was no direct exertion made in its behalf, when the only cultivation it received was from the mould of decaying Calvinism,— which, perhaps, we ought to speak of respectfully, because its decay operated like a rich compost for the crop that was to spring from it. The first generation of Unitarians were not made so by tracts, or by an association. No combined agency, no denominational action whatever, was at work. It does not appear that at any conferences or ministerial meetings heresy came in by debate. Unitarianism was neither advocated nor expounded. It grew of itself, from the causes which we have mentioned. Those causes and agencies, then, we believe to be still the most effective instrumentalities for the promotion of Unitarianism. Where they are not at work, any direct sectarian effort which we can exert will accomplish but little. Where they are at work, we have no more distrust as to the constant progress of our views, than we have of the effects of sunlight and air on meadows and gardens. Let the Scriptures be believed and valued and intelligently studied, let religious principles and institutions be heartily upheld, let a sense of spiritual liberty and accountability keep the soul free from man's impositions and in allegiance to God's laws, and let prejudices be set aside, and we will trust Unitarianism to its destiny. This test was put into application at the revival of our distinctive doctrinal views. We think it fair and just, beyond all debate. We are willing to rise or to fall by its applications in all future time.

So inadequate, in the view of some, has been the success of the efforts made by us in the way of proselytism, when compared with the ready adoption of our views before any such efforts were made, that it might seem as if whatever zeal we had exhibited had even injured our cause. Some may say that our cause prospered best when we did nothing in an antagonistic or sectarian way to advance it, but left Unitarianism to work its sure progress through the healthful influences already mentioned. If there be truth in this view, then there will be comfort in

the thought that we never yielded ourselves to any consuming zeal of a sectarian character. The apparent grounds for such a conclusion will readily occur to our minds. Two or three of them, at least, may be mentioned. The sharp definitions, and often naked abstractions and scholastic statements, into which our first Unitarians were sometimes driven in our controversy, had an unfavorable effect on many minds that were in a transition state, and made our theology unattractive to them. Again, the extreme reproaches which our Orthodox opponents heaped upon our views, in charging them with artifice, infidelity, covert deceit, and a dishonest treatment of the Scriptures, actually found some to credit them, and thus withstood in some quarters those tendencies of thought which were leading many into sympathy with us. And, once more, the fact that a few individuals from our communion have gone to the extremes of rationalism, has alarmed many. Their nervous fright has been aggravated by the positive assertion from unfriendly quarters, that those who resolve the contents of the Bible into myth and fable do but carry out in a legitimate way our principles of interpretation. The obvious answer to this last charge is, that the issue between Unitarians and Trinitarians concerns the *meaning* of records whose authenticity and historic faithfulness both parties admit and maintain: while the issue between believers and unbelievers in a revelation concerns the *credibility* and *authority* of those records. But this simple answer to a plausible objection has not occurred to all who may have been alarmed by the imputation cast upon the tendency of our Scriptural criticisms. It is a fact, recognized by writers most opposed to us in doctrinal opinion, that the most laborious and effective works in support of the authenticity and the credibility of the New Testament have come from the pens of Unitarians. Lardner and Norton will always sustain our claims in that direction.

These and other reasons might be given to account for the fact,—if it be a fact,—that our efforts in proselytism have not sensibly advanced our cause in any degree conformed to our reasonable expectations. We should, however, question the fact, at least in its unqualified assertion. We believe that the same causes which led the first generation of New England Unitarians, ministers and laymen, to adopt their views, are still in operation, and are everywhere working like effects. On this point we have no misgiving.

We care not to draw sharp distinctions between ourselves and Trinitarians. The line between us has become blurred, and in some places has been so trodden by passing feet, and by some that stand upon it, that we are not anxious to keep it fresh, still less to deepen it into a ditch or to build over it a breastwork for further hostilities with bristling weapons. But still we cannot for a moment allow that any essential step has as yet been taken towards reconciling the distinctive and peculiar tenets of Trinitarianism and Unitarianism. If all that we have read of Trinitarian theology has not clouded rather than enlightened our minds as to its prominent doctrines, we understand it as offering to us two very distinct points at which we are at issue with it. First, it confounds Christ and God; so that, instead of two distinct beings whose relation to each other and to men must lie at the basis of all intelligent and practical views of the Gospel, we have one being, now on the throne of heaven, then in the house of Peter or Lazarus; now praying, then hearing prayer; now dying on the cross, and then accepting his own death as a penalty paid to him by another. Here is inextricable

confusion, through which we cannot carry one clear thought or one intelligible idea: how, then, can we make such a theory the very root and life of our faith? The second point at which we are left still at issue with the Trinitarians, after all the attempts which have been made to reconcile our differences, is this. The essential peculiarity of their view of the Atonement is, that the death of Christ is made effective for our salvation through some mysterious, sacrificial influence which it wrought upon God: whereas the distinctive doctrine which we maintain on that point—leaving the mysterious efficacy of the death of Christ with God unthought of—is, that that last scene, like the whole of the Saviour's life, was designed to affect the heart and life of man, and to reconcile him to God. The confusion of mind which Trinitarianism causes us on the former point is increased, if possible, by the theory of its doctrine of the Atonement; for where two beings are needed, we have but one, if Christ be in any sense God. Here, then, are two very distinct divergences of doctrine, and they indicate to us the fundamental issues between Unitarianism and Trinitarianism. The Unitarian may choose from an almost infinite variety of views concerning the nature of Christ, as opinions among us do range from high Arianism to simple Humanitarianism. But still the Unitarian makes no concession to the theory which confounds the Being who sent with the being who was sent. The Unitarian may object to define even in his own mind the mode in which the death of Christ is made efficacious to salvation. But so long as he regards the cross as making its tenderest appeals to man, rather than to God, his belief is that it is man, and not God, who needs to be moved by that great sacrifice. We are at a loss to find any middle ground on which Christians can plant their faith between these opposing doctrinal theories. We know that the ambiguity of words and the modes of interpreting doctrinal formularies will cover much debatable ground. But when the question is concerning clear ideas, and intelligible propositions, we find it necessary to classify Christians under the one or the other category of Unitarians or Trinitarians. Without the least inclination to attach names to those who dislike to bear them, with sincere respect for those who think they stand on middle ground, and with a strong conviction that piety may thrive amid many different inclosures of faith, we nevertheless feel constrained to say that Unitarianism or Trinitarianism constitute the actual alternatives of religious opinion.

The Rev. Mr. Stearns of Cambridge Port,—a man whom we hold in profound regard and esteem for his excellence and purity of spirit,—in the discourse which he delivered this year before the Orthodox Pastoral Association, is reported by the New York Independent of June 3, as having advised his brethren to assume “a less repellent attitude toward our opponents of the Unitarian school.” It is also said, that “he brought into distinct and grateful recognition the fact of which the fathers prophesied at the time of the separation, that some of the people and ministers are returning to the Orthodox faith.” Now while we would gratefully reciprocate every kind and fraternal sentiment from that quarter, and do devoutly pray that the old acrimony of our strife may never be revived, we must plead our ignorance of any facts which indicate a return to Orthodoxy among our ministers or our people. The same implication is again conveyed in the same journal as warranted by the exercises at one of our conference meetings. The writer adds: “Already exchanges might take place between ministers of so-called

Unitarian churches, and those of Orthodox, with no compromise of the truth, or indorsement of error. God hasten it in his time!" Again we reciprocate the fraternal sentiment. But we are still troubled by misgivings. It would be painful indeed, if by and by these kind prognostics and promising signs should be recalled and denied, and we should be visited with a renewal of some old censures upon our use of ambiguous phraseology. May it not be that what our Orthodox brethren regard as tokens of some assimilation between us and them are to be explained by some more intelligible influences which have wrought upon either party respectively? Thus, our old controversy led us to advance many negative statements, and to bring forward our denials; a necessity which seemed to reduce our faith to its minimum. Calmer but as earnest times have brought out the positive force of those spiritual, evangelical views, which live as vigorously in our theology as in any other doctrinal system maintained throughout Christendom. At the same time our Orthodox brethren who had been driven from us in great part by their own depreciating and dreary representations of us as teachers of infidel or lifeless moral tenets, have learned that we never gave up the Gospel, and are many of them willing now to suppose that we never intended to give up any thing that we believe to be contained in the Gospel. The Orthodox claimed certain Scriptural terms and religious phraseology as exclusively their own, and resolved that such expressions should never be divorced from the ideas associated with them in their minds. For a time Unitarians gave over the use of such expressions, not because they for a moment yielded to the claim just alluded to, but because they wished to use expressions that would not keep alive erroneous conceptions. Now and recently the Orthodox see and hear that some among us are using what they think is their phraseology, and discussing some of their favorite themes somewhat after their style. It is evident that the facts which we have stated allow of inferences varying in depth and breadth according to the candor and fairness with which they are drawn, and the intelligence which is exercised about them. Our only anxiety is, that they may not be stretched beyond the truth in any case.

---

*Western Unitarian Association.* — Among the new religious enterprises from which we hope for much good fruit in the growth of Christian institutions over our country, we have now to mention the establishment of a Western Unitarian Association. A Convention of Unitarian ministers and laymen was held at Cincinnati, from May 7th to May 11th, at which, after much discussion, a constitution was drawn up, and plans were arranged for the annual gathering of the representatives of our churches at the West. Considering the wide distances in space over which our brethren there have their fields of labor, and that the nearest route from Boston requires a journey of nearly a thousand miles, all reasonable expectations were fulfilled by the presence at Cincinnati of four Unitarian ministers from the East, and sixteen from that side of the mountains. Very earnest and spirited exercises marked the occasion. Conference and prayer meetings were held on the mornings during which the Convention was in session. Three discourses were delivered beside those preached at the usual Sunday services. The Lord's Supper was administered, and the bonds of Christian sympathy were strengthened by social intercourse. Without offering any thing especially exciting or brilliant to draw off attention from the calm and delib-

erate wisdom which is most effective in such enterprises, the occasion met the wishes of our friends, and offers them a basis for hope. Our cause at the West presents to us an encouraging aspect. We have there several vigorous societies, no longer served by birds of passage from the East, but by men identified in their life's work with the regions and the inhabitants of our distant territory. The School at Meadville will supply from year to year the increasing demand which is sure to be made for new laborers. The noble church and the large and strong congregation at St. Louis is a monument of faithful, pastoral labor, and a token that equal devotion may look in other places for a similar reward. The flourishing society at Louisville, so fondly attached to its minister, is exerting a wide influence. The new church at Wheeling has a fair prospect of success. Detroit, Chicago, Geneva, and Galena are favored with the services of faithful ministers. Our cause at the West owes very much to the zeal and liberality and consistent efforts of Mr. Nahum Ward, of Marietta, Ohio. As one of the pioneers in his own region, a gentleman whose business relations have brought him into constant intercourse with a great variety of persons, and a most intelligent and warm-hearted Christian, strong in his Unitarian convictions, and equally urbane and decided in the expression of them, his influence has been very large. He has distributed tracts and books, has argued with opponents and strengthened friends, and, without confining his liberality to his own denomination, has always extended to its interests his best deeds. We have great hopes for the cause of liberal and enlightened religion at the West.

*Convention of Congregational Ministers of Massachusetts.* — This body, which still serves as the chief visible bond of union between the pastors and churches of the Congregational order in this Commonwealth, held its annual meeting, as usual, on the old "Election Day," Wednesday, May 26th, in the Supreme Court Room. Rev. Dr. Putnam, the Preacher for the year, officiated as Moderator. The usual reports of the Treasurer, Auditor, Central Committee, and Trustees of the Monis Fund, were presented and accepted. The Massachusetts Congregational Charitable Society, an incorporated institution whose benevolent object — the relief of the widows and orphans of Congregational ministers — is identical with the object of the Convention, holds in trust a fund of \$7,000 belonging to the Convention, and has in its own treasury funds which raise the whole amount consecrated to this charity to one hundred and three thousand dollars. The Rev. Mr. Trask of Fitchburg, in behalf of a committee, presented a report on the use of tobacco. The matter, not falling strictly within the purposes and scope of the Convention, did not detain the interest of the members, and was disposed of by a recommitment. The Rev. Dr. Todd of Pittsfield was elected as Second Preacher for the next year. It was announced on the next day, after the sermon, that the Rev. Mr. Hooker, of Falmouth, who stood as First Preacher for the next year, had declined the appointment. Dr. Todd, therefore, accedes to that office, and the Central Committee were charged with providing a substitute if any emergency should arise. Thanks were voted to Rev. Dr. Lowell on his resignation of the place which he had so faithfully filled, for forty years, on the Central Committee.

The Convention Sermon was preached in Brattle Street Church on Thursday, by Rev. Dr. Putnam. Text, Romans ii. 15. Subject, Conscience. The collection amounted to \$334.14.

*The Sunday School Society.* — The twenty-fifth anniversary of this society was celebrated on Wednesday evening, May 26th, in the Federal Street Church ; Hon. Stephen C. Phillips, President, in the chair. The Rev. Dr. Thompson of Barre opened the exercises with prayer. A juvenile choir contributed most appropriate aid to the services. The Rev. S. H. Winkley, the Secretary, read the Annual Report. The basis of this document was a statistical summary of the rise, growth, and number of the Sunday schools connected with our denomination, and its spirit and advice were well suited to infuse new zeal into the enterprise. Remarks were then offered by the President, by Rev. A. R. Pope of Somerville, Rev. O. C. Everett of Charlestown, Rev. John Cordner of Montreal, His Excellency Governor Boutwell, Rev. F. W. Holland of East Cambridge, Rev. A. P. Peabody of Portsmouth, and Hon. John C. Park of Boston. Mr. Peabody paid a most touching tribute — though at a severe trial of his own feelings, which nearly choked his utterance — to the eminent Christian virtues of his late parishioner, Deacon John W. Foster, probably the most successful and devoted of Sunday school superintendents.

---

*Children's Mission.* — The third anniversary of this modest agency of Christian benevolence was held in the Bulfinch Street Church, on Thursday afternoon, May 27th, Manlius S. Clarke, the President, in the chair. Prayer was offered by the Rev. Moses G. Thomas of New Bedford. The Treasurer, Benjamin H. Greene, and the Secretary, George Merrill, read their respective reports, and brief addresses were made by the following gentlemen : Rev. R. C. Waterston, Rev. F. T. Gray, Rev. C. F. Barnard, and Rev. S. H. Winkley, of Boston, Rev. Ralph Sanger of Dover, and Rev. Mr. Orrell of Providence, R. I.

---

*The Collation.* — This festival, provided by the Unitarian laity of Boston for the social enjoyment of their guests during Anniversary Week, was held at Assembly Hall, on Tuesday afternoon, May 25th. Nearly, if not quite, one thousand persons, more than half of them women, were seated at the tables, and they were welcomed by Deacon Clement Willis, Chairman of the Committee of Arrangements. Deacon Samuel Greele presided on the occasion. A blessing was asked by Rev. S. K. Lothrop, and thanks were returned by Rev. Dr. Kendall of Plymouth. The spirit of this festival was most admirably caught and communicated by Deacon Greele, who presided to the acceptance of all, and by most felicitous remarks, from time to time, called out the following gentlemen to address the guests : His Excellency Governor Boutwell, Rev. T. S. King, Hon. John C. Park, Rev. W. Mountford, Rev. W. G. Heyer, Rev. John Cordner, Hon. D. A. White, Rev. W. R. Alger, Rev. Mr. Taylor, Hon. James Savage, Deacon Willis, and Rev. Henry Giles. Amid the happy sensations which attended the close of these festivities, arrangements were made for their renewal next year.

---

*Society for the Relief of Aged and Destitute Clergymen.* — This Society is slowly accumulating the means which will enable its treasury from year to year to contribute sums, small it may be in amount, but still of a value most gratefully appreciated, to the disabled and dependent brethren of our denomination. Donations are from time to time acknowledged by the Treasurer, and, in view of the many appeals for equally worthy objects which are made in our community, there is rea-

son to commend the spontaneous kindness which has to such an extent favored this Society. For any large addition to its funds, it must look to bequests from those whose Christian sympathies may lead them to choose this direction for some portion of their wealth. The society held its third annual meeting on Wednesday morning, May 26, in the chapel of the Church of the Saviour, Rev. Dr. Frothingham presiding. The Treasurer, Rev. Dr. E. Peabody, read his Annual Report, but no public announcement is made of the recipients from its funds. The officers of the Society were reelected.

*Ministerial Conference.* — This gathering of Liberal Christian ministers was held in the chapel of the Church of the Saviour, on Wednesday, May 26th, extending its sessions over both parts of the day and part of the day following. Rev. John Pierpont was chosen Moderator. Rev. E. E. Hale offered prayer. Rev. F. D. Huntington was reelected Scribe of the Conference, and the gentlemen composing the Standing Committee were rechosen. The whole business of the Conference was facilitated by the rigid and methodical rules which were established for its guidance two years ago. The morning address, on Theology, was by Rev. J. H. Morison of Milton; the afternoon address, on Reform, was by Rev. A. P. Peabody of Portsmouth, N. H. The delivery of each address was followed by a discussion, which was necessarily brief and most imperfect. Indeed, the multiplication of addresses and meetings in Anniversary Week tends rather to impair the advantage to be gained from them, as brethren are distracted in their interest, and must rush away from one place to be present at another.

*Conference and Prayer Meetings, and the Lord's Supper.* — These devotional agencies of Anniversary Week were earnestly sustained this year. Meetings were held each morning at an early hour, each day in a different church, which were attended by throngs. The Lord's Supper was administered on Thursday evening, May 27, by Rev. John Cordner, in the Federal Street Church.

*Installations.* — The Rev. THEODORE H. DORR, formerly of Billerica and East Lexington, was installed Pastor of the Third Congregational Church in WINCHESTER, on Wednesday, June 2. Introductory Prayer by the Rev. E. G. Adams; Selections from Scripture by the Rev. J. I. T. Coolidge; Sermon by the Rev. Calvin Lincoln; Prayer of Installation by the Rev. J. S. Brown; Fellowship of the Churches by the Rev. W. P. Tilden; Address to the Society by the Rev. Dr. Hill; Concluding Prayer by the Rev. W. O. White.

The Rev. M. W. WILLIS was installed Pastor of the Unitarian Church and Society in BATH, ME., on Wednesday, June 12. Introductory Prayer by the Rev. C. Palfrey; Selections from Scripture by the Rev. S. Judd; Sermon by the Rev. S. K. Lothrop; Prayer of Installation by the Rev. Dr. Nichols; Charge by the Rev. Dr. J. W. Thompson; Fellowship of the Churches by the Rev. R. P. Cutler; Address to the Society by the Rev. F. T. Gray; Concluding Prayer by the Rev. J. Cole.